Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-222
Monday
20 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-222 *20 November 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Observer Urges Talks To Achieve Naval Parity *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Nov]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gerasimov News Briefing 17 Nov 3
Bulgarian Communist Party Changes 3
Supply of MiG-29's to Cuba 3
UN Children's Rights Convention 3
Shevardnadze Meets Women Journalists Group 3
Discusses International Problems *[TASS]* 3
Further Details *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 4
Military Policy Conference Ends, Results Noted *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 5
UN Views Soviet-French Statement on Mideast *[TASS]* 5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Preparations for Gorbachev Meeting Noted 6
Meets With Former Ambassadors 6
Meets With Experts at Camp David *[TASS]* 6
Shevardnadze Receives Ambassador Matlock *[TASS]* 6
Senate Nagorno-Karabakh Resolution Protested *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 7
Quayle, Cheney Comments on Defense Noted *[TASS]* 7
Commentator Ponders U.S. Defense Spending Cut *[Pasko on Moscow Radio]* 7
Primakov on Impressions of U.S. Visit, Talks *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 8

China

Heilongjiang Governor Arrives in Moscow *[Moscow Radio]* 11
Received by Vorotnikov *[TASS]* 11
Premier Li Peng's South Asia Tour Viewed *[Moscow International]* 11

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Wind Up Visit to Japan 12
Radio on 15 Nov News Conference *[Moscow International]* 12
Yakovlev on 'Dual' Nature of Ties *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 13
Comments on Visit to Japan *[Moscow TV]* 15
Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 15
Hints at Review of Relations *[Tokyo KYODO]* 15
'Sources' on 'Joint Administration' of N. Isles *[Tokyo KYODO]* 16
Economic Cooperation With DPRK Described *[Moscow International]* 17

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev Receives Indian Artist in Kremlin *[Moscow TV]* 18
Bhutto Says Mujahidin To Free Soviet POW's *[TASS]* 19
Trade Protocol Signed With Syria *[TASS]* 19
Nishanov Receives PLO Envoy in Moscow *[TASS]* 19
Ahmad Khomeyni Appointed to Iran Security Council *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 19

East Europe

Krenz Discusses Economy, Rules Out Reunification *[Moscow TV]* 20
Krenz Criticizes Party Leadership, Honecker *[TASS]* 20
GDR's Modrow on Economic, Political Reforms *[TASS]* 21
Notes Need for 'Greater Democracy' *[Moscow TV]* 21
GDR Citizens 'Try Out' New Cross-Border Travel *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Implications of New GDR Travel Rules *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 22
SED Preparations for December Congress Noted *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 22
Reportage on 17 Nov Prague Demonstration *[TASS]* 23
Description of Events 23
Claim of 'Disinformation' 23
Denial of Student Death 23
CSSR Bans 1-2 Day East Bloc Visits *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 24
Medvedev Receives CSSR's Fojtik 17 Nov *[Moscow TV]* 24
Belousov Meets CSSR Metallurgy Minister *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 24
CSSR Leaders Thank USSR for Greetings *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 24
Bulgarian Politburo, Other Personnel Changes *[TASS]* 24
New Bulgarian Leader Addresses Parliament *[TASS]* 25
Thousands at Bulgarian Rally for Glasnost *[Moscow Radio]* 25
Dismantling of Zhivkov Power Network Urged *[Moscow TV]* 26
Bulgarians Await 'Tangible Results' From Reform *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 26
Gusev Discusses Cooperation With Bulgarians 27
Received by Mladenov, Atanasov *[TASS]* 27
Attends Cooperation Meeting *[TASS]* 27
Bulgaria's Mladenov Receives Bazovskiy *[Moscow Radio]* 28
CPSU Central Committee Greets RCP Congress *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 28
Vorotnikov Departs for Romanian Party Congress *[TASS]* 28
Arrives in Bucharest 19 Nov *[TASS]* 28
Romanian Economic Situation Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 28
Poland's Rakowski Discusses German Reunification *[TASS]* 29
Protocol Dispute Blocks Rakowski-Kohl Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]* 29
Soviet-Polish Party Perestroyka Seminar Ends *[TASS]* 29
Poland's Independence Day Commemorated 29
Greetings Sent to Polish Leaders *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 29
'Difficult Period' Seen *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 30
Jaruzelski Cited on Local Authorities' Tasks *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 30
Solidarity Government Target for Complaints *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 31
Advent of 'Political Pluralism' in Hungary Noted *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 31

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Speaks on GDR Changes *[Moscow TV]* 32
SPD's Rau To Meet Gorbachev in Moscow *[Hamburg DPA]* 33
Portugalov on Intra-German Relations
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 17 Nov] 33
Gorbachev: German 'Reunification Not on Agenda' *[Hamburg DPA]* 34
FRG's Suessmuth, France's Fabius Visit 34
Received by Gorbachev *[TASS]* 34
Suessmuth Meets Ethnic Germans *[Hamburg DPA]* 35
Suessmuth Views Ties, EC *[Hamburg DIE WELT 17 Nov]* 36
Moscow TV Views FRG Reaction to GDR Events 36
Woerner Cited on East Europe Changes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Nov]* 36
News Coverage of Gorbachev Visit to Italy Cited *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 19 Nov]* 37
PCI Debates 'Cardinal Reform' of Party *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 37
Flight Inaugurates Baku-Istanbul Air Route *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 38

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Economic Reform Conference

Aganbegyan on Results of 3-Day Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Abalkin Comments on Protest, Conference *[Moscow TV]* 39
Reform Conference Panel Discusses Finance *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 40

Supreme Soviet Session

First Reading of Travel Bill Approved *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 42
Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Affairs Committee *[Moscow TV]* 42
Notes Significance of U.S. Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 43
PRAVDA Report of Address *[18 Nov]* 44
Supreme Soviet Groups Discuss Leasehold *[TASS]* 48
Supreme Soviet Resolution on Ownership Law *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 48
Implications of Bill Analyzed *[Yefimov on TASS]* 49
Text of Draft Law on Ownership *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 49
Supreme Soviet Session Agenda Outlined *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Managerial Principles To Be Viewed *[TASS]* 56
Economic Bill Discussion Postponed *[TASS]* 57

Political & Social

Georgian Supreme Soviet Reserves Right To Secede *[TASS]* 57
Georgian Deputy Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 57
Vorkuta Mine Strikes Continue *[TASS]* 58
Status of Mines *[TASS]* 58
Only 3 Pits Working *[AFP]* 59
Ryzhkov, Others Meet With Miners 17 Nov 59
Ryzhkov Addresses Miners *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 59
Discuss Current Situation *[TASS]* 60
Moscow TV Airs Meeting 61
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Answer Students' Questions *[Moscow TV]* 67
Gorbachev Queried on GDR Events *[Moscow TV]* 79
Ligachev on Students, Current Issues *[Moscow International]* 80
Further Reportage on Student Forum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Nov]* 81
Gorbachev Attends RSFSR Meeting *[TASS]* 85
Proceedings Reported *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 85
Pugo Interviewed on Party Membership *[TASS]* 86
AUCCTU Chairman on Unions' Future *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Letter to EEC on Soviet Journalist's Detention *[Paris AFP]* 87
Armenian Supreme Soviet To Meet 30 Nov *[Yerevan Radio]* 87
Latvians Mark Independence Day 18 Nov *[TASS]* 88
550,000 Said To Demonstrate *[Hamburg DPA]* 88
More on Celebration *[Moscow TV]* 88
Agreement on Latvian Religious Broadcasts *[TASS]* 89
Estonian Parliament Passes Election Bill *[TASS]* 89
Estonian Public Opinion Poll Results *[MOLODEZH ESTONII, 18 Oct]* 89

Economic

Sitaryan Discusses Foreign Economic Challenges *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 22]* 92
Specialist Defends Past Foreign Trade Role *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 28 Oct]* 94
Inauguration of BAM Railway Reported *[GUDOK 7 Nov]* 95
Minsk Environmentalists Block Quarry Proposal *[TASS]* 98
Norilsk Gas Pipeline Damage Reported *[Moscow TV]* 99

Scientific

'Cosmos-2049' Launched Into Orbit *[TASS]* 99
Details Given for 'Energiya' Rocket Program *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Cosmonauts Continue Research Aboard 'Mir' *[TASS]* 100
US-USSR Space Launch Agreement Described *[Moscow TV]* 100
Safety Chief Cited on AES Shutdowns *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 100

Military

Soviet Defense Posture Discussed *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 13 Nov]* 102
Army, Navy Political Directorate Sits *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]* 105
Yazov Visits PRAVDA Editorial Office *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 106
Golf-Class Sub Withdrawn From Baltic Fleet *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Nov]* 107
'Shield' Military Trade Union Described *[TRUD 28 Oct]* 107
Officials Observe Missile Troops, Artillery Day *[Moscow Radio]* 107
Estonian Draft 'Refusenik' Sentenced *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Nov]* 107

Observer Urges Talks To Achieve Naval Parity

PM1911210589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Observer V. Pustov article under rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "To Move Toward Each Other"]

[Text] There are regions on the planet which, by virtue, one might say, of lasting circumstances (great economic and strategic significance, concentration of considerable opposing forces, existence of protracted acute regional conflicts, and so forth), constantly rivet the attention of the international public and of political and military circles. Among these regions the Mediterranean is very noticeable. In recent days and weeks the gaze of observers has also been directed toward it in connection with two upcoming major events. At the end of November and the beginning of December M.S. Gorbachev will pay an official visit to a Mediterranean country—Italy. Then, 2 and 3 December, M.S. Gorbachev will have a meeting with President G. Bush, alternately on board a U.S. warship and a Soviet warship off the coast of Malta. Both events are perceived as political actions of exceptionally great significance, which are called upon to help deepen and develop positive trends in international relations and to warm the political climate on our continent and on the planet as a whole.

According to an Italian Foreign Ministry spokesman, the talks in Rome will be aimed at developing Italian-Soviet relations and will embrace general topics relating to East-West relations and detente with a possible emphasis on the problems of the Mediterranean.

A particularly great deal is being said and written in the world now about the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting [vstrecha v verkhakh]. Statements by politicians of different tendencies and by authoritative representatives of the public reveal an understanding of the fact that the informal [neofitsialnyy] nature of the meeting does not rule out the possibility of discussing very urgent large-scale issues there which affect the interests of not only the USSR and the United States but also the entire world community. Which issues specifically? There are diverse suppositions in this regard. In the opinion of a number of Western mass media, the recent changes in Poland, the GDR, and other Warsaw Pact countries will occupy an appreciable place in the dialogue. Disarmament issues are not ruled out either, although Washington, as foreign observers point out, has so far preferred to postpone their discussion until the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in late spring or early summer of next year. Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, believes that the Soviet leader may advance new peace initiatives and, in order that they do not catch President Bush unawares, he must expect a proposal to withdraw all foreign troops from European countries over several years.

In a CBS-TV interview U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney voiced confidence that the U.S. and Soviet leaders will discuss the question of parity in the strengths of NATO and Warsaw Pact troops in Europe. What can be said in this regard? The topic is, of course, very important and vital. Parity is extremely necessary at the lowest possible quantitative level of the sides' armed forces which would completely rule out the possibility of a sudden attack and the waging of offensive operations.

For all that, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to imagine what parity there can be without including naval forces in the process of limiting and reducing conventional armed forces. Particularly as naval forces with their increasing missile might, aircraft carriers, aircraft, and landing troops are capable of waging combat operations not only at sea but also on dry land. We must not close our eyes also to the fact that NATO has tremendous superiority over the Warsaw Pact on the seas and oceans. It has, for example, 4.5 times as many naval personnel, 7.6 times as many ocean-zone ships, twice as many ships in terms of total tonnage, and 2.5 times as many naval combat aircraft.

There is also, I would say, the geostrategic factor, which also has a great influence on the combat potential of the sides' naval forces. The Soviet Union, for example, is not able to use its Navy to the same extent as the United States. For straits controlled, as a rule, by U.S. allies would lie across its path. As for the U.S. Navy, first, it has clear superiority in deck aircraft and long-range sea-launched cruise missiles and, second, it can rely on numerous naval bases, ports, and airfields surrounding the USSR and its allies. Both factors ensure the possibility of operating within range of vital centers in our country and in the countries of our allies.

It is perfectly clear to unbiased observers that under these conditions considerable reductions in conventional armed forces not affecting naval forces would lead to a disruption of the existing general equilibrium of forces on the continent and in the waters surrounding it. This in turn would have a very adverse effect on strategic stability and on the security of one of the sides—in this instance, the Warsaw Pact states.

U.S.-NATO military superiority in the Mediterranean appears still more striking. The Soviet Union keeps a squadron there, which at present numbers 1 cruiser and 3 other surface ships, as well as 20 support vessels. They do not have naval bases in the Mediterranean. The Syrian port of Tartus alone is used by Soviet ships as a material and technical supply point, where they can call after a long voyage to carry out preventive maintenance.

The U.S. 6th Fleet is in a totally different position in the Mediterranean. It currently consists of an aircraft carrier, a helicopter carrier, a battleship, 7 cruisers, 11 surface ships of other classes, submarines, including nuclear-powered missile carriers, and 16 auxiliary vessels. Some 1,800 marines are stationed on board landing

ships. All these combat means are designed to be used as NATO's strike force in the South European theater of military operations.

The U.S. 6th Fleet has at its disposal dozens of naval bases and control, communications, intelligence, tracking, and rear service points situated almost around the entire perimeter of the region—in Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Israel, and other countries. The Pentagon does not intend to reduce such a ramified base system and the forces stationed in the region. As is known, at the request of Spain, the United States has pledged to withdraw 72 F-16 fighter-bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons from Torrejon de Ardoz (an airbase near Madrid) over the course of 3 years. However, it did not take it long to secure the agreement in principle of the Italian Government to shelter these "exiles" on its territory. NATO's military-political leadership is to make the final decision on this question. But, before the verdict is in, these aircraft are participating in the current exercises in Italy's skies together with another U.S. tactical air group.

According to the West German magazine STERN, considerably more than 1,000 items of nuclear ammunition are concentrated on U.S. ships and in shore dumps in the Mediterranean.

The naval forces of Mediterranean NATO countries are preparing to cooperate with the U.S. 6th Fleet under combat conditions. Even without the navies of Spain and France, which do not belong to the bloc's military organization, and of Greece, which has suspended its membership of that organization, the combined naval forces of the other countries (Italy and Turkey) represent quite impressive strength. There is 1 aircraft carrier, more than 40 escorts, including cruisers and destroyers, 28 submarines, 50 combat aircraft, and also a considerable number of tank landing ships, other ships, missile boats, and auxiliary vessels. They are all also concentrated in direct proximity to the borders of Warsaw Pact countries.

When comparing forces we should, all the same, hardly disregard the naval potential of countries such as Spain and France. Their fleets are taking an increasingly active part in joint NATO maneuvers and other measures. Spain, for example, has taken on such missions as control over the Strait of Gibraltar and naval and air operations in the West Mediterranean and the East Atlantic. And it evidently was not for nothing that the Madrid newspaper DIARIO-16 wrote: "We are already involved up to our ears in NATO's military structure."

Under various farfetched pretexts the United States and, following it, its allies stubbornly refuse to enter into negotiations over limiting and reducing naval forces. Manifestations of readiness to reach agreement on extending confidence-building measures, including an exchange of information, to naval forces are still imperceptible on their part. The reasons lie on the surface, as it were. While he was defense secretary, C. Weinberger declared: "Neither President Reagan nor I doubt that the U.S. Navy will rule the seas right through to the next century." No grounds for believing that the present Pentagon chief holds a different opinion in this regard can be seen yet.

The Soviet Union sets itself diametrically opposite tasks before the end of the century. The most important of them is on a global scale: To reverse the arms race and ensure that the world enters the 3d millennium without nuclear weapons. The negotiating process which embraces our continent and is based on the new political thinking is aimed at creating a common European home. The resolution of tasks on a regional scale will also accord with the interests of all mankind.

One of the priorities is to ensure the security of the Mediterranean, which is closely linked with security in Europe. With a view to turning this region into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, as is known, the Soviet Union has advanced a number of constructive peace initiatives aimed at reducing military potentials there, establishing confidence-building measures, and ensuring security in Europe. Unfortunately, they still remain unanswered.

In the course of visual observations and photography sessions the Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov, who are continuing their work on board the "Mir" manned complex, noticed that, unlike the highly polluted North Sea, the Mediterranean appears relatively clean. It is probably still more important that the military-political climate of the Mediterranean region, which remains one of the most dangerously explosive regions, should also become clean and healthy. This can be achieved on the indispensable condition that the opposing sides move toward each other in resolving such a vital problem.

TASS Reports Gerasimov News Briefing 17 Nov

Bulgarian Communist Party Changes

LD1711145189 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—The pace, nature and extent transformations in various socialist countries and the advent of new people in key posts are inalienable parts of the choices made by every party, country and people, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a news briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed that the Soviet Union ruled out any interference in the purely internal affairs of sovereign states.

Commenting on yesterday's plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Gerasimov said that changes in the upper echelon of the Bulgarian Communist Party were consistent with the activity of the new Bulgarian leadership. Its main guidelines were set out by Bulgarian Communist Party chief Petr Mladenov at the November 10 plenary meeting of the party Central Committee, Gerasimov said.

Supply of MiG-29's to Cuba

LD1711181889 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—Comments by members of the U.S. administration on reports of the Soviet delivery to Cuba of MiG-29 jets represent an attempt "to somewhat worsen the situation" in Soviet-U.S. relations on the eve of the Mediterranean summit meeting, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a news briefing here today.

These comments are nothing short of an attempt to cast doubt on the Soviet implementation of the 1962 agreement with the U.S., he said.

Gerasimov said that under an agreement between the Soviet Union and Cuba, concluded several years ago, two training MiG-29 jets had been supplied to that country. The specifications of the MiG-29 fighter, as an interceptor used for air-defence purposes, are well known.

It was displayed at international air shows on many occasions, the Soviet spokesman noted. He drew attention to American attempts to give a broad interpretation to the 1962 agreement.

"The USSR is not undertaking anything in Cuba which would violate the above agreement," Gerasimov stressed. "The Soviet Union intends to continue adhering to it, proceeding from the fact that the U.S. side strictly fulfils its part of the agreement as it has confirmed."

UN Children's Rights Convention

LD1711182989 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—"The draft convention on children's rights, passed at the U.N. General Assembly's third committee on Wednesday, is of great political and social significance. It concerns the most vulnerable part of human society: Children who need the care of all states," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said today.

He expressed hope that the U.N. General Assembly would endorse the draft convention and stressed that the USSR would promote the early ratification of the convention.

"We hope that other states will act in the same vein," Gerasimov said.

Shevardnadze Meets Women Journalists Group

Discusses International Problems

LD1811151589 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova:

What is the Soviet attitude to major international problems? What are the principles underlying Soviet diplomacy in the conditions of perestroyka? These and many other questions were asked at a two-hour meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by members of the "33 and 1" International Club of Women Journalists. The meeting was held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry today.

Shevardnadze said that there have never been similar meetings in the history of the Foreign Ministry. But much is taking place in Soviet society for the first time now. "Of course," the minister said, "there are a lot of difficulties, many problems. We often make decisions with delay which results in losses, but we are building democratic socialism and democratisation processes are continuing."

The restructuring of foreign policy and Soviet diplomacy is the continuation of events inside the country, the minister said. He rejected attempts to counterpose the successes of Soviet foreign policy to the internal problems of the Soviet Union. "Without perestroyka," Shevardnadze said, "successes would have been impossible in foreign policy."

A whole number of questions concerned the Soviet attitude to developments in European socialist countries. The recent decision by the GDR leadership, the minister replied, is absolutely logical and "we solidarise with it. We have no doubts that this is the only true way."

The Soviet minister pledged support for the new Bulgarian leadership. "I am convinced that Soviet-Bulgarian relations, which were always excellent, will now receive a further boost," he said.

On the division of Europe into blocs, Shevardnadze said that the Soviet Union has long been advocating their elimination. But the Warsaw Treaty will preserve its stabilizing functions as long as the West refuses to meet the Soviet proposal halfway. Events in Poland and Hungary did not lead to any changes in this attitude.

The journalists showed much interest in the Soviet minister's assessment of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Shevardnadze said he was optimistic. The meeting would be interesting and useful.

About his personal life and the family, he said the support and understanding of the entire family—the wife, daughter and son—help him a lot. "I don't have family problems," he said.

The minister is fond of reading both classic works and contemporary literature. He confided that he used to write poetry as a young man, which was never published however.

Today's meeting at the Foreign Ministry is the second involving 33 representatives of Soviet and foreign mass media and the Soviet leadership. Last march they met Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Further Details

PM1911180189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[N. Larionova report: "World Problems Over a Cup of Tea"]

[Text] It has recently become natural for our country's politicians to hold meetings with journalists in a relaxed atmosphere—over a cup of tea, as it were—when it is possible to speak calmly and unhurriedly about what is important and urgent. It has to be admitted that such conversations frequently produce more than speeches from a rostrum because it is possible in 1 hour of dialogue to understand a problem far better than by listening to a 2-hour speech.

This conversation took place out of work time, on Saturday 18 November, on the seventh floor of a high-rise building on Smolenskaya-Sennaya Square. The people meeting over a cup of tea were USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and 33 women journalists—members of the Committee of 33, as this organization is officially called. The 20 journalists of foreign publications accredited in Moscow and the 13 Soviet journalists representing major publications and agencies literally bombarded Eduard Amvrosiyevich with questions, endeavoring to elucidate for themselves certain aspects of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

All without exception were interested in questions connected with the future talks between M.S. Gorbachev and the U.S. President. The meeting without a set agenda elicited heightened interest among the representatives of the mass media. The foreign minister dwelt on this question in detail. He said that he was optimistic and did not rule out the possibility even of accords on major problems. In any case the meeting must be useful both in the sphere of our countries' bilateral cooperation and for the world community as a whole. The U.S. President is clearly interested in having fuller information on perestroyka in the Soviet Union, being convinced of its irreversibility, and ascertaining the prospects for the development of economic cooperation. U.S. business people are showing heightened interest in trade with the Soviet Union but, in order for things to go well, they must be certain that the process of democratization is irreversible.

And E.A. Shevardnadze convincingly demonstrated that perestroyka is not to be reversed. The peaceful revolution, the revolution in people's consciousness, has proved very complex. But the achievements are very palpable: People have awakened out of indifference. Changes are occurring in the consciousness of everyone, and even the politicians who began perestroyka are today no longer who they were yesterday. Changes are happening very quickly.

Naturally, the approach to the Soviet Union's foreign policy has changed, too. The minister singled out one characteristic feature of this approach: Looking at the whole world via the human dimension. This attitude toward the world community has opened up broad prospects for cooperation with all countries and peoples. This approach leads to the peoples' mutual enrichment and to rapprochement among states and systems. This approach makes it possible to rise above local troubles and to resolve global problems through joint efforts. The signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is the most splendid example of the effectiveness of this approach.

The sincerity of the Soviet Union's desire for peace is demonstrated by the fact that 40 percent of large military enterprises are working to create capacities for the production of consumer goods. So the new approach in foreign policy is already yielding material fruits and working for perestroyka, the minister pointed out.

Women are women, and they were, of course, interested in how long diplomacy will remain the prerogative of representatives of the stronger sex. Perhaps it is time for a new approach to be manifested in this sphere, too? For the legendary A. Kollontay [reference to soviet woman diplomat of twenties ands thirties] has so few successors.

The warming of the political climate would have been impossible without the help of world public opinion. Not one politician, not one state can disregard this influential force now. But public opinion is shaped by the mass media. This means by journalists. This is why politicians

converse with them so frequently and so thoroughly, and this was why this meeting took place in the high-rise building on Smolenskaya-Sennaya Square.

Military Policy Conference Ends, Results Noted

PM1711142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[A. Lopukhin report: "Toward a World Without Wars or Violence"]

[Text] The international scientific conference "New Thinking and Military Policy" ended in Moscow yesterday.

The new thinking emerged and is developing as a result not of pious intentions but in response to the inexorable demands of today's rapidly changing realities—the need to remove the threat of universal destruction, save civilization, and ensure the life of future generations. These problems are now becoming the subject of real concern for an increasing number of people, and neither the military professionals in whose hands destructive weapons are concentrated nor the scientists whose job it is to elaborate military doctrines and policy can remain on the sidelines.

This was emphasized at the conference, where political and military leaders and scientists from more than 40 countries discussed problems of war and peace, army and society, collective security, humaneness and nonviolence, the economy, and culture.

"There is no alternative today to preserving and developing peace. Mutual trust and cooperation in reducing the threat of war, promoting nuclear disarmament, and creating a system of universal security are needed above all in relations between states belonging to different systems," states an appeal of the conference's organizational committee to political and military leaders and scientists in all countries.

How can we overcome the mutual misunderstanding and suspicion, the intolerance, and the old stereotypes of confrontation and position-of-strength politics? How can the day be brought nearer when the world will be free of war, violence, and the threat of war? Many political and military figures and scientists are prepared to make their contribution to the solution of these problems. In order to achieve this, as the conference has shown, it is necessary to step up the dialogue and international cooperation in various spheres, including the coordination of the efforts of the various associations of research scientists working on problems of peace, the army, and society. The aim of these efforts is the dissemination of the new thinking in the military and political sphere for the sake of strengthening trust and security throughout the world.

UN Views Soviet-French Statement on Mideast

LD1711200789 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 17 TASS—The text of a joint Soviet-French statement on the Middle East and Lebanon has been circulated as an official document of the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly and the Security Council here today.

The statement was passed in the course of the recent Moscow meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his French counterpart Roland Dumas.

The sides reaffirmed their readiness to start consultations of the U.N. Security Council permanent members to study ways for the beginning of a peace process in the Middle East, and their mutual intention to promote political settlement of the situation in Lebanon.

United States & Canada

Bush Preparations for Gorbachev Meeting Noted

Meets With Former Ambassadors

LD1811000189 Moscow TASS in English 2322 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS—President Bush met on Friday in the White House former U.S. ambassadors to the Soviet Union George Kennan, Malcolm Toone, Thomas Watson and Arthur Hartman.

Their conversation was part of preparations for the forthcoming meeting between President Bush and President Gorbachev scheduled for December 2 and 3 off Malta in the Mediterranean.

Since the beginning of November, Bush has had a number of encounters with government and non-government specialists and former high-ranking administration officials, including Zbiegnew Brezinski and Henry Kissinger.

Presidential spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said that Bush intends to continue preparations for the meeting with the Soviet leader over the upcoming weekend at Camp David.

The President is scheduled to hold consultations on Saturday with people from various brain trusts, university experts on the Soviet domestic situation and specialists in East-West relations.

Fitzwater said that President wanted to get all kind of advice from as many people as possible before the very important encounter with Gorbachev.

The presidential spokesman stated that the United States was not preparing any initiatives for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting. He said it was going to be an unofficial discussion of general problems.

The aim of the meeting, he said, is to try and achieve greater understanding of each other's thinking and positions.

According to Fitzwater, the changes in Europe, their impact and consequences for NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the overall state of East-West relations will dominate the meeting's agenda.

Meets With Experts at Camp David

LD1911073689 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 19 TASS—U.S. President George Bush conferred with U.S. non-governmental experts on the Soviet Union at his Camp David country residence on Saturday within the framework of preparations for an unofficial shipboard meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev near Maltese shores.

On Friday Bush had discussed the question with former U.S. ambassadors.

According to a White House spokesman, over the past several days the president also had telephone conversations dealing with the Malta meeting with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, French President Francois Mitterrand, the FRG's Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

In an interview with the Mutual Broadcasting System on Saturday, the U.S. President said that the forthcoming meeting with the Soviet president was needed first of all to avoid "unnecessary misunderstanding" between the two superpowers.

"I use the analogy of two big ships passing in the night. I do not want that to happen. I want to be on the same wavelength as much as we can. So I would say the meeting is designed to see that the two ships do not pass in the night for lack of light," he said.

During the interview Bush skeptically assessed the possibility of finalising the elaboration of a draft agreement on reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe by the time of the December meeting.

Reporting Bush's preparation for the Malta meeting, the UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL news agency specially singles out words by an administration spokesman who said that the President is not planning dramatic changes in the American policy of deterrence which has been in effect for forty years now.

Shevardnadze Receives Ambassador Matlock

LD1811194989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1844 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request.

During the discussion, J. Matlock handed a message to Mikhail Gorbachev from U.S. President George Bush which was a response to an oral communication by the Soviet leader concerning the situation in Central Europe in light of the processes of democratization and renewal of all spheres of social life which are now dynamically developing in the GDR.

Jack Matlock also handed over a reply message from U.S. Secretary of State James Baker addressed to the USSR minister of foreign affairs and concerned with the search for ways toward a settlement in Central America.

Our side confirmed the USSR's principled course toward achieving an all embracing political settlement in that region on the basis of the well known accords which were reached by the Central American states themselves.

Other issues of international politics and bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations were also examined.

Senate Nagorno-Karabakh Resolution Protested

PM1911204989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report on the Soviet protest to the United States over "interference" in Nagorno-Karabakh entitled "At the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] First Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh called in United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock to the USSR Foreign Ministry 19 November and made the following statement:

The U.S. Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has passed a resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh.

This official document sets forth "pretensions" and "demands" to the Soviet side, and is an unceremonious attempt to teach it how, in the U.S. authorities' view, this purely internal matter shall be resolved. In fact, American lawmakers have assumed that they can instruct sovereign peoples of another state which actions to take.

The Senate committee's decision has provoked a sharp response from Soviet citizens, and their indignation is understandable.

It is well-known that representatives of the Azerbaijani and Armenian people and republican and central authorities are working hard for a settlement in Nagorno-Karabakh. The solution of this conflict requires a particularly delicate and responsible approach and consideration of a host of other factors.

Under these conditions, the brazen and uncalled-for interference not only violates the elementary norms of international laws, but can provoke destabilization and bring new suffering to people at a time of a fledgling tendency towards settlement in Nagorno-Karabakh. Ambassador Jack Matlock, who has just returned from a tour of Armenia and Azerbaijan, must be aware of this.

We cannot but regard this instigating action as a relapse into "cold war" which can harm efforts of our two countries towards a constructive development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been authorized to lodge a vigorous protest to the U.S. side in connection with the above-mentioned attempt at gross interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

Quayle, Cheney Comments on Defense Noted

LD1711194189 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said that estimates of the Soviet Union's current military preparations by members of the Bush administration are outdated at best, and absolutely false at worst.

The congressman expressed concern that inflated estimates of the Soviet military budget might lead to irrational increases in U.S. military spending.

U.S. Vice-President Dan Quayle alleged in a recent televised interview that the Soviet military budget continues to grow. Similar statements were made by U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney.

These conclusions run counter to the latest conclusions of the U.S. State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency.

THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that in the opinion of U.S. Government experts, the Soviet Union cut military spending in 1989, as President Gorbachev promised.

The latest statements by Quayle and Cheney apparently reflect the shift of accents in speeches of representatives of the Pentagon and of the U.S. military-industrial complex.

They have asserted for four decades that the most important task of the U.S. was to oppose "the growing military menace of the USSR" which can only be achieved by an increase in the U.S. military budget.

Now it turns out that the increase in the U.S. military budget has become an aim in itself, which is less and less related to the problem of ensuring the United States security and the military- political situation in the world.

Cheney, for instance, admits that the threat to U.S. national security is now much less than at any time in the post-war period. But he said this should not influence the determination of the scale of the U.S. military budget.

However strange, the Pentagon leaders are disturbed even by the Soviet Union's unilateral troop reductions. The reason for this is that U.S. military leaders believe that this might encourage the demands to lower U.S. military spending.

Commentator Ponders U.S. Defense Spending Cut

LD1911191489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney has reported on plans to cut back U.S. defense spending in the 1991 financial year. In an interview published on Saturday, Cheney stated that the question of how great these cuts should be is under discussion. Citing unnamed officials, THE WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES newspapers, and also the CBS television company, have reported that expenditure may be cut by $10 billion, and also that Cheney has given his subordinates instructions to present a plan for the reduction of the

Pentagon's budget by $180 billion over the next 5 years. Over to the commentator Vladimir Pasko.

[Pasko] One hundred and eighty billion dollars is no small sum. It is $36 billion per year. If one starts from the fact that the United States has maintained its military expenditure at a level no less than $300 billion for many years, then this would represent over 10 percent annually. One can only welcome such a reduction. This is what is troubling. In naming these figures the U.S. press cites anonymous sources. Nowhere has this been announced officially. What remains a fact is that the United States has just allocated $305 billion for military purposes for next year. This is approximately $4 billion less than this year but far from those figures being forecast by the U.S. press, and can in no way be compared with those reductions which we are making. Let me remind you that we are cutting our military allocations next year by over 8 percent, by over R6 billion.

It seems to me that this statement by Cheney is, in many ways dictated by domestic motives, by the need to respond with at least something to the loud demands within the country and from abroad to cut defense spending. The present administration has been under the pressure of these demands from its 1st day in power. Back in December last year, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote, for example: The challenge thrown down by Gorbachev is the background against which the new President has to make a fundamental decision in the period of intensifying demands within the country, and in Western Europe, about the reduction of military spending.

As is known, no fundamental decision was adopted. Moreover, in the last few days when the question of the new military budget was being dealt with in Congress, the administration resorted to subterfuge. It did not provide a precise answer to the question as to whether the Soviet Union is cutting its military expenditure or not. As a result, the chairmen of both Armed Services Committees of the Congress stated that they have ordered that there be comprehensive reappraisals of the Soviet military threat as a whole, in order better to evaluate the administration's budget inquiry for the 1991 financial year. What is more, both of them stressed that the present 5-year plan for U.S. defense spending, which envisages a growth of allocations in real terms over each of the next 4 years, no longer meets requirements as a result of the weakening of the Soviet threat, and is not realistic because of financial restrictions and opposition in Congress.

And so, it was after all this that Cheney's promising statement came, with the publications citing unnamed sources and making almost identical, reassuring, conclusions to the effect that the administration has begun the biggest review of its military strategy since the time of the Vietnam war.

Soviet-U.S. relations, as they have been developing in recent years, indeed inspire hope for an improvement. The intention which the U.S. defense secretary has just stated can, I repeat, only be welcomed. But I prefer to put my faith in real affairs. And one must suppose that the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will show how they will really develop.

Primakov on Impressions of U.S. Visit, Talks

PM1711174189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, by A. Lyutyy: "Meeting With America. Postvisit Impressions"; date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, recently visited the United States. The visit met with a broad response in the United States and received extensive coverage in our press, arousing considerable interest among readers. We asked the delegation head to talk about the results of the trip.

[Lyutyy] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, as you know, this was the Soviet parliamentarians' first official visit to the United States since the election of the new Supreme Soviet. How did it go?

[Primakov] It was indeed the first time the United States had met the new Soviet parliament. The delegation comprised people who hold various views of the tactics of perestroyka. The Americans noticed this. At the same time, they noticed the seriousness and sense of dignity with which all the people's deputies without exception represented the USSR Supreme Soviet and, moreover, the country as a whole. We had very many meetings—by no means fleeting, sometimes lasting many hours. We had detailed discussions with our U.S. colleagues in the Congress. We met with U.S. President G. Bush and Secretary of State J. Baker. Leading U.S. political specialists, representatives of business circles, scientists, and cultural figures were present when we addressed the Council on International Affairs in New York and Los Angeles and the Brookings Institute in Washington. We gave news conferences in all the cities we visited. We had meetings with audiences of thousands at Dodge City in Kansas, in the central United States, and in Bangor, Maine (the most easterly state).

All the delegation members—highly professional lawyers I. Bisher and A. Sobchak; the worker V. Yarin, who, incidentally, has a knowledge of political and economic matters equal to that of the professionals; interesting party official A. Braun; S. Ryabchenko, A. Krayko, N. Petrakov, and A. Yablokov, scientists with a broad range of specialisms; and the splendid musician L. Isakadze—were asked numerous questions. It is clear from them that Americans are indeed interested in the processes taking place at home in our country. This interest could be noted, figuratively speaking, both horizontally and

vertically. Horizontally because we observed it in various cities and states. Vertically since tremendous sincere and keen interest in the processes under way in our country was manifest in numerous conversations, ranging from the U.S. President to ordinary farmers. I believe that Americans realize that perestroyka is changing the fate of the world.

It is hard to imagine, without visiting the place, how the attitude in the United States toward our country has changed in under 5 years. I have visited America on several occasions. During the pre-perestroyka period I frequently saw that Americans, like us, bore a heavy psychological burden: Sentiments dictated by tension and the expectation of some unforeseeable danger were manifest everywhere. Now there are quite different sentiments and a radically different attitude toward us.

Some people in our country still, of course, persist in their one-track idea, saying that if people in the imperialist United States support perestroyka, we must be doing something wrong. But this idea is utterly naive. People in the United States—including realistic politicians at the very top—support perestroyka because they realize that perestroyka is changing the character of international relations. Because it has indeed removed the threat which loomed over the whole world. I don't agree with those people who believe that the threat came only from our side. But it also came from our side because we took part in the arms race, albeit when forced to.

[Lyutyy] How do Americans regard the difficulties that are arising in the way of perestroyka?

[Primakov] People in America realize that there are difficulties in the economy and in interethnic relations. But, while realizing this, Americans often seem to be trying to set our minds at rest, yet it was kind of awkward to hear them saying: You are a rich country, you have everything you need, you have every opportunity to overcome the difficulties. Maybe this was Americans' reaction to the totally pessimistic assessments made for them by some of our people prior to this.

I am against a dual truth: the one inwardly directed within the country, the other directed outside. At the same time I do not want to be considered a man who is trying to present everything in a rosy light. All the same we must be realists—even those people who are accustomed to seeing everything in our country in black colors realize that our country has done a great deal of positive things today.

[Lyutyy] Are there influential people in the United States who oppose the development of relations with the USSR?

[Primakov] There are people, there are forces. In this connection the U.S. press names people who hold fairly high posts in the hierarchy of power. For instance, they insisted on writing that a U.S. National Security Council leader had prepared a statement which could be regarded as a "warning" against developing relations with us. But the secretary of state did not recommend that he deliver it, and so the speech was not made. In this case, although I am wholly in favor of glasnost, I am inspired by this instance of censorship.

[Lyutyy] How do your impressions enable you to view the prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Primakov] This was for us an extremely impressive meeting with America. With present-day America. With an America which has its own concerns, its own problems, including those which are far from being resolved. With an America which, on the whole, we have undeniably lagged behind in the economic and scientific-technical context. But with an America which realizes the Soviet Union's place and role in today's world.

It would be naive to think that the United States will only do business with us because the USSR has many missiles. Of course, this element does exist. But serious Americans realize that we present great interest as a U.S. partner not only politically and culturally but also economically and in the scientific-technical sphere—particularly in the future. If we have obtained comparable results to the United States in military hardware and have accumulated much knowledge in this sphere—we have a fairly good manufacturing process and even our equipment is not bad—we can now use all this potential in the process of converting a considerable proportion of military industry. Many U.S. political specialists believe that conversion will proceed in the nineties if, of course, the trends toward the normalization of international relations continue.

Many people in the United States also realize that we have great scope for cooperation ahead of us inasmuch as we will proceed toward ruble convertibility and toward our national economy's increasing incorporation within the international division of labor. We got the impression that Americans do not want to miss the boat under such conditions.

I had several conversations where a question was raised which I had not thought about before. Two Americans—one a political specialist and the other a businessman—said quite definitely: If the United States does not stir itself in economic ties with the Soviet Union now and only skates across the military-political surface, without delving deeply into the economic ground, there will be no firm foundation for developing such relations. However, the point then is also that, according to one of my interlocutors, the USSR may develop a desire "to put all its eggs in the European basket." But West Europe after 1992 will gradually be transformed into a single economic entity and, judging by reliable forecasts, will be even stronger economically than the United States. And if our vast market is also added to West Europe under these conditions, the United States will, to put it mildly, have food for thought.

This is an interesting formulation of the question. Incidentally, it quite correctly associates future prospects with the U.S., rather than the USSR's, choice of course.

It is well known that, while elaborating the project for a common European home, we are not presenting it as a closed organization and are not seeking any counterbalance in Europe to the United States.

[Lyutyy] From what you have observed, how do people in the United States regard the elements of U.S. legislation that discriminate against the USSR? I refer primarily to the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which deprives our country of most-favored-nation status in trade with the United States.

[Primakov] Everything indicates that this amendment is now being targeted by a whole series of U.S. senators, congressmen, and businessmen. G. Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, and R. Dole, leader of its Republican minority, who received us, said that "something must be done" about this amendment. Correspondingly, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker also spoke about this. According to him, they clearly should work toward an initial 1-year suspension of this amendment.

[Lyutyy] The Soviet-U.S. summit in the Malta area was announced during your visit. How was this news received in the United States?

[Primakov] By the way, although it was mutually agreed to announce this simultaneously in Moscow and Washington, this information was leaked in the United States and, as usually happens, U.S. journalists found out about it a little earlier. Judging by what was said at the State Department, this fact aroused the indignation of the White House. But that is not all that important. The main thing is that the announcement of the forthcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush immediately became the center of attention for everyone in the United States.

The first responses were [illegible]nat of a contrived sensation—that is typical of the U.S. mass media. For instance, the fact that the meeting is scheduled to be held aboard warships was played up: Will this mean the world being divided into spheres of influence? It is clear that some Americans have not lost interest in the geopolitical—shall we say?—approach, if we don't use another word for it. Some journalists racked their brains as to who displayed the initiative. The U.S. President dotted the "i's" by announcing that he was responsible for the idea of an interim meeting.

However, these are all minor details. The main indisputable conclusion is that the United States wants this meeting. It is also indisputable that this meeting is associated with the possibility if not of a new breakthrough in U.S.-USSR relations then at any rate of solid preparation for one.

I must point out that we were asked many questions about East Europe in connection with the impending summit. We were asked, with allusion to 1968, whether we had abandoned the "Brezhnev doctrine." Of course, we were not in the past guided in our relations with the other socialist countries by any doctrine bearing the name Brezhnev. But at any rate it is quite clear that now, in the perestroyka period, we proceed firmly from the premise of the need to observe to the maximum each country's freedom of choice and not to interfere in its domestic affairs. This approach is also required from others—otherwise the international situation may be destabilized.

[Lyutyy] You met with President Bush and had a long conversation, much longer than planned. In brief, what questions were discussed and what impression did you get of the President as an individual?

[Primakov] I brought a message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It seemed to me that Bush was delighted with this message. Altogether he has a very high opinion of M.S. Gorbachev as a political leader. He said as much, stressing that he had met him several times before.

Bush asked about our perestroyka. He even asked how the United States could help overcome our difficulties and agreed with my answer—mainly by negotiating new agreements in the sphere of arms reductions and broadening economic ties with us. He also agreed that all this is to our mutual advantage.

I got the impression that he was impressed by my unembellished description of our affairs and my realistic assessment of what is going on in our country. It was pleasant to hear the President saying during his news conference that his meeting with the Soviet parliamentarians had convinced him once again that the clock of perestroyka in the Soviet Union cannot be turned back.

Speaking about the "pause" in our relations right after his administration came to power, the President said that this was not only necessary in order to analyze the path traveled but also to prepare for further progress.

He is the first U.S. president I have met. But I have heard and read quite a lot about other presidents—Nixon, Carter, and Reagan. Bush leaves the impression of being the most professional and well-informed.

[Lyutyy] A REUTER report on your visit said that when you were received at the U.S. Senate, Democratic majority leader Mitchell did not advise you to copy the work of the U.S. Congress, complaining of various manifestations of difficulties in its work.

[Primakov] And strictly speaking we have no intention of doing so. We have our own values, our own traditions, and our own history. We made no secret of this, incidentally. For instance, lobbyism is manifest in the U.S. Congress—and we have absolutely no need of this. The Supreme Soviet must be completely independent of anyone.

There are other negative aspects of the work of the Congress. For instance, the Senate is discussing some particular issue—but the hall is half-empty: Out of 100 senators there are maybe 15-20 sitting there. But when the bells for the start of the voting ring in the building, all

the senators drop their other business and literally run to cast their vote. I do not believe that we should copy this practice.

At the same time it would be odd not to select positive elements from another country's experience that may take root in our soil. There is much that is interesting there which we must certainly imitate. For instance, the ramified information system. Using this, every deputy can obtain a rapid response to any question. The business of familiarizing senators and representatives with all the requisite material has been honed to a fine art.

There are also common problems. For instance, many of our American colleagues are opposed to the constant relays of Senate and House sessions. We were told that the point is—and this is very similar to the situation in our country—that some people speak "for the television," as though they were addressing their voters.

[Lyutyy] The final communique pointed out that you inquired about the procedure for Senate ratification of treaties.

[Primakov] Incidentally, a word about the communique. A communique was agreed for the first time in the history of relations between the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

As for the ratification of treaties, we did indeed inquire about this. We, too, have ratified treaties in the past, but the process was rather pro forma. We now want to turn ratification into a process that will obligatorily include hearings involving experts at the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee.

[Lyutyy] Can you tell us what impression this trip made on the other delegation members?

[Primakov] I believe that in general our impressions coincide. For the observations and conclusions I have mentioned were also formed during numerous conversations and exchanges of opinions among all delegation members.

Of course, it would be wrong to believe that complete unanimity reigned within the delegation on all questions. But, in my view, that is natural. It would, on the contrary, be ridiculous if we fell into line like tin soldiers. However, on one occasion we did stand as if on command. This was in Dodge City, the cowboy capital, where the city's mayor jokingly gave each member of the delegation a sheriff's star. After this we all got into line and I told the mayor that he could now rest easy about order and security in his city.

China

Heilongjiang Governor Arrives in Moscow

LD1611200389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1980 gmt 16 Nov 89

[Text] A delegation from the PRC headed by Shao Qihui, governor of the Heilongjiang Provincial People's Government, has arrived in Moscow at the invitation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers. The guests were welcomed at the airport by Comrade Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Received by Vorotnikov

LD1711185489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 17 Nov (TASS)—V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium today received Shao Qihui, governor of the people's government of the province of Heilongjiang (PRC) who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

V.I. Vorotnikov warmly greeted the guest from the PRC and in a friendly conversation informed him about the present stage of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, of the political transformations being carried out in the country, about the progress of reforms in the economic and other areas and the development of the process of democratization. Shao Qihui noted that the journey across the country has allowed him to get more closely acquainted with Russia, and to see the changes that are taking place in Soviet society. He expressed the hope that the visit will serve the development of relations between the province of Heilongjiang and the Russian federation, as an important element of Soviet-Chinese cooperation.

The conversation took place in a constructive atmosphere.

Premier Li Peng's South Asia Tour Viewed

OW1411142789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Station observer (Kolesnov) on Li Peng's visit to Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Nepal]

[Text] China has traditionally maintained close relations with these three South Asian countries. The visit by a Chinese head of state to those nations is aimed at further expanding and strengthening such relations. The first leg of the tour is to Islamabad, where Li will meet with Pakistani Prime Minister Bhutto. We must remind our listeners that China was the first foreign country the elder Bhutto, as head of Pakistan's Government, visited

in the late 1940's. Bilateral and international issues will be discussed at the upcoming conference in Pakistan. The topics of discussion are to include the situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan's relations with neighboring India.

The second leg of Li Peng's tour will take him to Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh, where the Chinese premier is scheduled to arrive on 17 November.

The final leg is to Katmandu, Nepal. Li Peng is due to arrive there on 19 November. Nepal is expected to ask China to increase the number of locations available for conducting barter trade. At present, China has only three such locations. Not long ago, China provided assistance to Nepal for the construction of a highway going into Lhasa, the capital of Xizang.

Trade between China and Nepal rose by 15 percent last year, and now totals $25 million. China's trade volume with Bangladesh also increased significantly last year, amounting to $130 million, and trade volume with Pakistan amounted to $385 million. In recent years, China has achieved substantial progress in expanding political, military, scientific, technological, and cultural contacts with these three South Asian countries. Observers in Beijing believe that the Chinese premier's visit will contribute to an expansion of wide-ranging cooperation with those countries. I believe that Li Peng's tour is a result of the recent improvement in relations between China and India, a leading country in the region. The improvement in relations has been most evident since Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi visited China, and reached a new phase following Chinese Vice Premier Wu Xueqian's visit to India in October.

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Wind Up Visit to Japan

Radio on 15 Nov News Conference

OW1911012089 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Announcer-read report by Moscow Radio Tokyo correspondent Potapov on 15 November activities in Japan of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member Yakovlev]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by CPSU Central Committee Politburo Member Yakovlev is continuing its visit to Japan. On 16 November, the delegation went to Kansai for a tour of Kyoto and Osaka.

The following is a report on the delegation's activities on 15 November, the fourth day of its visit to Japan:

On 15 November the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation visited the Judicial Affairs and Budget Committees of the Japanese Diet and listened to their work reports. Politburo member Yakovlev held talks with Takako Doi, chairwoman of the Japan Socialist Party, the No 1 opposition party. The two discussed the international situation, including the situation in East Europe, the question of the development of Soviet-Japanese relations and the outlook for such relations, as well as relations between the two parties. Yakovlev proposed that Chairwoman Takako Doi visit the Soviet Union early next year. Yakovlev also held talks with leaders of the Japan Communist Party.

On the afternoon of 15 November, Yakovlev gave a press conference at the Japan National Press Club. Yakovlev said: In all respects—both in terms of the number of meetings and in terms of contents, which is the more important of the two—our current visit to Japan is rich and useful. Of course, it is still too early to sum up the results, but to sum up my impressions so far, I can say that the time has come for us to develop our bilateral relations more actively, watch their future more carefully, and envision problems and possibilities they hold.

Yakovlev stressed that the visit is a good omen. He added: This does not mean that there are neither concerns nor apprehensions about relations between our two countries. However, even at the 1974 Osaka international symposium, I stated that, in Soviet-Japanese relations, the principles of cooperation and good-neighborliness and trust will eventually prevail.

Yakovlev emphasized: To the Soviet Union, good and open relations with all neighboring countries are equally important. We think that all our foreign policies toward Europe, Asia, the Pacific, the United States, and all other regions are of the same importance. In Soviet-Japanese relations, good things are being pointed out little by little. Political dialogue is active. Already there is dialogue, not two separate monologues. Trade and economic relations and scientific and technological relations are also developing. Progress in the cultural and humanitarian sectors is also remarkable.

Yakovlev continued: We hope that all these tendencies will further develop, that Soviet-Japanese relations will be established on the basis of true good-neighborliness and become rich in contents in many areas, and that the level of relations will become commensurate with the positions and roles in the world played by the peoples of the two countries. On the basis of the further development of Soviet-Japanese relations and their improvement in all areas in terms of both quantity and quality, we must persevere and thoroughly pave the way for the conclusion of a peace treaty.

Asked about the prospects for the conclusion of a peace treaty, taking into consideration Japan's demand for the return of the northern territories, Yakovlev pointed out: It is abnormal that no peace treaty has been concluded in bilateral relations between countries like Japan and the Soviet Union. A bilateral working group has been organized to work on the peace treaty. The Japanese side has

not agreed with our position and vice versa. The only normal method is to hold constructive dialogue at the working group meetings.

Yakovlev stressed: The Soviet side hopes to hold forward looking and significant dialogue with the Japanese side on all issues. These dialogues will help to extensively develop Soviet-Japanese relations in various areas. We are putting a particular emphasis on Supreme Soviet President Gorbachev's visit to Japan scheduled for 1991. We firmly believe that a Soviet-Japanese summit to be held when he visits Japan will give new momentum to Soviet-Japanese relations. We hope that the Japanese side will also move in this direction.

These are remarks made by Yakovlev at a press conference at the Japan National Press Club.

Yakovlev on 'Dual' Nature of Ties

PM1711131589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview in Japan with A.N. Yakovlev, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission, by PRAVDA correspondent I. Latyshev in Japan: "Dialogue and Cooperation Are the Way to Good-Neighborliness;" date of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The visit to Japan by the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.N. Yakovlev, is the center of attention among the Japanese public these days. Television news programs and the press are providing extensive coverage of the delegation's meetings with leading members of the parliament and government and leaders of the country's political and business world. A.N. Yakovlev's statements on problems relating to the current state and further development of Soviet-Japanese relations are receiving lively comment. PRAVDA's correspondent in Japan I. Latyshev asked A.N. Yakovlev to answer a number of questions.

[Latyshev] I would like to hear an overall assessment from you as head of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission of the current situation in the Asia-Pacific region. How has the present global turnaround in international events toward detente affected this situation? How have the Soviet Union's peace initiatives, which were reflected most fully in M.S. Gorbachev's speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk, influenced the development of events in this region? Are there signs of moves toward a reduction in the levels of military confrontation between the nuclear powers in the region? Has progress been made in normalizing relations between the countries of the region?

[Yakovlev] Of course, M.S. Gorbachev's Vladivostok initiatives, which he developed and supplemented in Krasnoyarsk, played a crucial role from the viewpoint of influencing the situation in this region. Although we cannot yet say that there have been any tangible changes with regard to certain aspects of these initiatives, nevertheless by and large I think that the situation has changed. I would like to point out that the Soviet Union is precisely fulfilling the commitments it assumed in the Soviet leader's Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk speeches. The regularization of Soviet-Chinese relations must be ranked first. This fact per se is of exceptional importance and is having a determining influence on the overall system of situations which have taken shape in this region. And not only there. Of course many—particularly the most important—aspects of this settlement will only make a more obvious and full impact in the long term. But facts are facts: The regularization of relations between the Soviet Union and China is playing a crucial role in the improvement of the situation in this region and the world as a whole.

Nor must we disregard the fact that we are withdrawing our troops from Mongolia. The fact that there are no longer any intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles in this region has also changed the situation considerably. Whereas ordinary people in the region hitherto lived with a sense of some danger, they can now regard the situation differently. Next, see how relations with Indonesia have improved. We have displayed the readiness to take part in the economic development of the Asia-Pacific region, and to join international regional economic organizations, including banks and so on. The settlement in Cambodia is also proceeding in a positive direction, albeit with difficulty. If we take the whole situation overall I believe that we can see a gradual departure from confrontation and the threat of conflict.

You may ask whether everything has been done here. Of course not. All possibilities have not been exhausted, in particular, in resolving political questions. The relatively modest changes in the economic sphere are the weak link in this entire process. We still have plenty to do here. During a discussion of this problem at a session of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission recently it was unanimously noted that we still have very many most obvious reserves from the viewpoint of economic development. Many of our departments bear direct responsibility for the fact that, having manifesting inadequate economic activeness in the Asia-Pacific region, they have displayed sluggishness, tardiness, and a lack of, I would say, economic and entrepreneurial imagination here.

[Latyshev] What is your opinion of the state of Soviet-Japanese relations? Are you satisfied with the current level of economic, cultural, social, and other ties between the two countries?

[Yakovlev] This is a case where I can say both yes and no with a clear conscience. And not to avoid giving a straight answer. The point is that a dual situation has taken shape. On the one hand we have the trend toward more active relations between the two countries. Cultural contacts are proceeding very rapidly, people have begun to visit one another more frequently. There have been more ties in the public and scientific spheres and

more youth exchanges. Our political ties are not so bad overall either, they are sufficiently intensive: Politicians pay one another regular visits and discuss many problems. We are now finding a common language with Japan on a number of international problems.

But we cannot be satisfied with the current level of bilateral economic relations. It seems to me that our economic departments are showing a lack of persistence and gumption here. On the other hand, I am not inclined to blame our side alone for everything. Japanese business circles also lack sufficient foresight. They seem to be too complacent over their current position in the world and have bewitched themselves with their broad ties with and good markets in the United States, West Europe, and the developing world. They have also done this in another area. It is well known that they are moving on from trading in commodities to trading in technology. They have tremendous successes in the sphere of high-technology and resource-saving output. But correct forecasts are also needed in the sphere of importing resources. It is not impossible here that Japanese business may miss the moment for revising its guidelines.

But, irrespective of this, I believe that there could even now be more substantial economic ties between Japan and the Soviet Union. Namely, economic ties, because our trade is in fairly good shape; but people engaged in trade 1000 years ago, too, and there are no particular subtleties in this, so we should think about creating a strong economic base for relations between our two countries. Look at the facts: We now have more than 1,000 joint enterprises in our country, but only approximately 20 with Japan, and only 9 in operation; and what is more we must look at how effective they are from the economic and production viewpoint. If this data is compared with the role of Japan and the Soviet Union in the world economy, it is clear that it is embarrassing to talk about this number of joint Soviet-Japanese enterprises. It is hard to tell who is to blame here or who is underestimating what, but we can see that both sides have very rich reserves and capacities. I want to stress that we are asking nothing from Japan. But we can only be amazed that Japanese business is not displaying its usual foresight here.

[Latyshev] How do you treat the claims circulated by certain representatives of Japan's Government and military circles concerning the presence of a "Soviet military threat" which is prompting Japan to further improve its armaments?

[Yakovlev] In my opinion, only people who have just landed on earth after a long stay on another planet can, at the end of 1989, talk about a "Soviet military threat." Admittedly, there may be a definite purpose to this claim. Obviously, there is some specific economic interest for the military business skulking behind these assertions. We can only gesture with our hands. If any circles in Japan want to arm themselves, let them go ahead and spend their money in vain. It's their business, it's their money. But I believe that those people who are striving in the contemporary situation to advance even further along the arms path are in danger of ending up like people who have lost their sense of humor.

[Latyshev] How do you rate the reception you and the entire USSR Supreme Soviet delegation have been accorded in Japan?

[Yakovlev] Our delegation was greeted very well, in a human fashion. We have been conscious of warmth, attention, and a desire to talk and understand our viewpoint on a number of questions. The conversations have taken place in an atmosphere of great attention to our country and the desire to seek ways to further develop relations. Here I would first like to note the completely sincere interest in perestroyka and in the transformations that are taking place in the Soviet Union. Apprehensions were also voiced regarding how perestroyka will proceed further and whether any other forces will gain the upper hand in it. The question of how reliable a Soviet partner is with regard to the advisability of making capital investments in our industry, infrastructure, and so on was also discussed. There was all of this, but by and large the desire to know more about the Soviet Union prevailed. This is how I account for the great attention paid to the delegation.

[Latyshev] What are your impressions of your meetings with the main leaders of the Japanese political world? In your view, what are the real ways of overcoming the existing differences between the two sides and most swiftly concluding a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty?"

[Yakovlev] It is hardly worth conducting an inventory of what was discussed or concentrating attention on our points of agreement and disagreement. There is consensus on the main point—both the Soviet side and Japanese politicians unanimously favored peaceful good-neighborliness. The Japanese expressed support for the healthy development of international relations, the cornerstone of which are the Soviet initiatives. They all said with one voice that perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the leader of our transformations are still the center of world attention. I frequently heard statements voiced here in the spirit of hope that the Soviet Union will be the locomotive for the constructive development of the international situation, disarmament, and the other favorable processes initiated in 1985.

But we must not fail to mention the "territorial question," which was raised by practically all the interlocutors. At the same time they also listened attentively to our arguments. We underlined that public opinion exists not only in Japan but also in the Soviet Union and that this public opinion follows attentively all the foreign policy steps taken by the Soviet Government and the Soviet leadership, particularly on such questions as the country's security, its position in the world, and the legal base of its relations with the world outside, and above all with neighboring countries.

We know the Japanese side's stance, they know ours. They consider our arguments contentious, we consider

theirs so. This kind of discussion could probably be conducted ad infinitum. In this connection I said that it would be better to take a third path—the path of calm and constructive dialogue, the path of developing bilateral relations on a very broad front. It is this path that is most in line with our peoples' interests. I told our Japanese colleagues that when a mighty river flows—and now the mighty river of detente and normalization of relations is indeed flowing through the world—it sweeps away confrontation, hostility, and mistrust in its path and carries it off as scum; you cannot single out just one stream and change its speed, artificially slowing it down. There is no need either to artificially politicize economic relations; we must take a realistic look at the new situation in the world.

[Latyshev] What predictions can you make with regard to the immediate and long-term prospects for establishing and developing Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness?

[Yakovlev] I personally believe in the development of Soviet-Japanese cooperation and good-neighborliness. Our forebears lived as neighbors, so will our descendants. The two sides are natural partners. of course, both sides must make efforts to develop our cooperation since, as the saying goes, it takes two to tango.

Comments on Visit to Japan

LD1811175489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Comrade Yakovlev completed its visit to Japan today.

[Correspondent V. Tsvetov, identified by caption] On the last day of the delegation's stay in Japan, (Iokhe Sasakawa), president of the Ryoichi Sasakawa Health Assistance Fund, presented Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev with 1 million disposable syringes as a gift to the Soviet people, in the presence of prominent Japanese businessmen. Sasakawa said that the fund is motivated by a desire to reinforce the friendly feelings that the Soviet and Japanese peoples have for one another. Before flying off to Moscow, Comrade Yakovlev, the head of the delegation, gave an interview for Vreyma:

[Begin recording] [Yakovlev] It is hard to single out any one thing as being the most important, but my personal impressions boil down to the following. We have always devoted a very great deal of attention to relations with Japan, but I think that now, reflecting on what I have seen, reflecting on the discussions I've had here, we probably should take stock once again, as it were, of all that we have, and this should be a detailed stocktaking. And we have to look once again at what positive things our country can do to develop these relations, taking into account the tremendous interest in our country and in our relations that I have seen here on the part of the Japanese.

[Tsvetov] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, the content of your conversations here will probably still be studied in detail and closely analyzed. But what are your personal impressions regarding the willingness or the desire of the leaders of the Japanese Government and legislative bodies to expand and develop Soviet-Japanese relations constructively?

[Yakovlev] My impressions on this are perhaps...well, what I'd say is generally good impressions but with nuances. What I mean by this is that the general attitude among business circles, political circles, and, well, among the people in the factories that I managed to visit is favorable. But at the same time, now and again, one can sense a kind of extreme caution, an attempt to over politicize economic relations. But all the same, on the whole, to repeat myself, it's not these nuances and complications that matter; these can all be surmounted, given a desire on both sides. On the whole, nonethless, one can sense that Japanese business and political circles want to develop relations with the Soviet Union. [end recording]

[Tsvetov] The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation left for home. [video shows Yakovlev at gift presentation ceremony; interview with Tsvetov]

Returns to Moscow

LD1911000489 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet today returned to Moscow from Japan where it had stayed on an official visit.

The delegation was headed by Aleksandr Yakovlev, USSR people's deputy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and head of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for International Politics.

Hints at Review of Relations

OW1911043689 Tokyo KYODO in English 0421 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 18 KYODO—Aleksandr Yakovlev, a top aide to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev just back from a week-long visit to Japan, hinted Saturday that Moscow will review its policy toward Japan and take a new initiative for improved bilateral relations.

Yakovlev, who visited Japan as head of a delegation of the Supreme Soviet (parliament), gave the indication in an interview with the state-run television.

He said that the Soviet Union should think what positive initiative it can take to promote its relations with Japan.

The No. 2 Politburo member, however, stopped short of directly referring to the long-standing territorial issue between the two countries over the Soviet-held four Japanese islands located off Hokkaido.

Yakovlev implicitly criticized Japanese policy of linking politics to economics, saying Tokyo has politicized economic issues.

Japan has insisted that the return of the four islands is the prerequisite for better bilateral relations while the Soviet Union has contended that the two countries should promote economic and other cooperation.

During his stay in Japan, Yakovlev met Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and other Japanese leaders. He said that the Soviet Union will explore "a third way" to break the impasse in Japan-Soviet relations.

'Sources' on 'Joint Administration' of N. Isles

OW2011132589 Tokyo KYODO in English 1240 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 20 KYODO—The Soviet Union is in favor of "international cooperation" with respect to three islands and a group of islets in its far eastern extremes which are claimed by Japan, Soviet diplomatic sources in Tokyo said on Monday.

Officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, made the remarks in relation to Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's reported statement at a press conference in Moscow on Saturday that "joint administration" of the disputed islands is an "interesting idea."

But they stressed that Shevardnadze reportedly prefaced his assessment with an elucidation of Moscow's fundamental position that the area in question is sovereign Soviet territory.

Shevardnadze's reported remarks, which have yet to be confirmed, would not represent a shift in Soviet policy on the territorial issue with Japan, the officials said.

The Soviet Government has "no objections" to the strong interest expressed by the regional governments of Sakhalin Island and the Kurile chain, both north of the Japanese island of Hokkaido, that their region become "a site for international cooperation."

"There are various proposals as to how this international cooperation is to be carried out," one official said, giving as examples joint ventures and tourism.

Japan maintains that its so-called "northern territories"—Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and the Habomai island group—are not part of the Kurile Archipelago and is seeking their unconditional reversion en bloc to Japan.

The islands, seized by the Soviets in the days following the end of World War II, have throughout the postwar period stood as the major obstacle to a peace treaty.

Shevardnadze's reported remarks followed of the idea of "joint administration" of the islands reportedly floated in a foreign policy committee of the Supreme Soviet on November 17.

The Soviet officials acknowledged that discussion is now taking place in the Soviet Union on "the best way to use these territories for the benefit of both the Soviet Union and Japan."

While Moscow basically wants international cooperation throughout its territories, the difference here is that the territory in question is claimed by Japan, they said.

The diplomats said that "unrepresentative" opinions being circulated in the Soviet Union in favor of making territorial concessions to Japan are merely an example of the country's trend toward "pluralism" and must be taken with a grain of salt.

The officials expressed satisfaction with the just-ended visit to Japan of a Soviet parliamentary delegation led by Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev, who is regarded as the No. 2 leader in the Kremlin after President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Yakovlev's visit served as an "important step" in laying the groundwork for Gorbachev's proposed trip to Japan in 1991, they said.

Officials said that Yakovlev's visit had never been intended to achieve a specific goal other than to deepen understanding of basic positions in the context of an expanding high-level political dialogue.

"In our opinion, this goal was satisfactorily achieved," said an official, adding that the visit served as a sign that normalization of ties is progressing steadily.

But the diplomats called the improvement "insufficient" for the times and said there should be a boost in the level and content of political dialogue.

"Since the role of political dialogue as an instrument in normalizing bilateral relations is increasing, it must bear more constructive results from now on," one official said.

On Yakovlev's mention in Tokyo of a "third way" of breaking with of the status quo, the diplomats repeated his suggestion to reporters in a press conference last week not to search for any hidden meanings in his comments.

They said Yakovlev was merely referring to the promotion of a multifaceted relationship encompassing politics, economics, cultural, scientific and technology exchanges, as well as personnel exchanges.

All elements of a comprehensive relationship should be promoted simultaneously and with equal emphasis, the Soviets said.

Yakovlev's reference to dialogue in bilateral working groups formed on the issue of a peace treaty does not represent the concept of a third option in its entirety, the officials stressed.

Expanding on the upcoming peace treaty talks to be held in Moscow on December 18-19, the officials implied that the territorial issue should not be accorded a high priority.

Discussions at this stage, they said, should be focused on clearing up issues on which both sides differ little, if at all, "if we are going to mark progress."

Work on a text for the treaty must be accorded importance, they said, reminding reporters that both sides are in agreement that the talks are primarily geared toward completing a peace treaty, not a territorial settlement.

On Japan's principle of linking economic cooperation to progress on the territorial question, the diplomats said the Soviet Union is not forcing economic cooperation on Japan.

"If Japan is at present not prepared to go forward with economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, well then that can't be helped," said one official.

The official said Moscow will just have to look for a way to "compensate" for Japan's lack of interest in cooperation, but he did not elaborate.

Economic Cooperation With DPRK Described

SK1111102089 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Report by station correspondent Mikhail (Presov) from Pyongyang]

[Text] Today, there are scores of enterprises in the DPRK in which Soviet and Korean experts work shoulder to shoulder. Not long ago, another enterprise, Songjin Refractory Material Plant in Kim Chaek, was added to the list.

A fundamental reconstruction of the plant is being considered, based on a blueprint drawn up in the Soviet Union.

(Illiya Nadinovich), chief engineer working on the spot, says:

[Begin (Illiya Nadinovich) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] Songjin plant was built in (?1948). Old equipment and hard manual labor are still the way things are in the plant. So, the Korean side asked the all-union office of [name indistinct] for cooperation in rebuilding the plant.

Eleven experts from (?Kharikov) and [name indistinct] in Leningrad have come to Kim Chaek to discuss and perfect the blueprint we have drawn up. (German Smilov), chief engineer of the all-union fire-resistant materials research institute in Leningrad, heads our team.

We met with leaders of the plant and functionaries [words indistinct] and confirmed many particulars. I can say with satisfaction that the work of clearing the blueprint is nearing its conclusion. [end recording]

[Station correspondent Mikhail (Presov)] Why is our country participating in the reconstruction of this enterprise?

[Second announcer, speaking for (Illiya Nadinovich)] The fact is, refractory materials that the metallurgical industries are so much in need of are in short supply in the Soviet Union. This explains much of why we are participating in the reconstruction.

The DPRK has a large reserve of raw fire-resistant materials. Songjin plant has a bright prospect. At the moment, this plant produces 70,000 tons of fire-resistant material a year.

When it reaches the production capacity envisioned in the blueprint, this figure will go up to 150,000 tons a year. Eighty percent of the products will be supplied to the Soviet Union (?in exchange for) the blueprint and facilities.

[(Presov)] When will the construction begin?

[Second announcer, speaking for (Illiya Nadinovich)] This problem has not been settled yet. But I believe it will be around 1991. Construction is expected to take 31 months. So, if the construction goes as planned, the plant will be put to operation in 1994.

[(Presov)] Soviet-Korean cooperation is positively progressing in the light industrial sector. Many a garment plants and complexes in our country have signed contracts with DPRK plants in the same field for cooperative production.

Men's shirts, children's shirts, women's one-piece house dresses, and jackets are being made here with materials supplied from the Soviet Union. The finished products are supplied to Soviet shops in many districts and they are popular to a certain extent.

Developing the cooperative production required a large number of experts, and scores of Soviet [word indistinct] and engineers are now working in the DPRK. One of them, (Kamara Sikchi), works in (?Hochongang) plant in Hamhung.

[Begin (Kamara Sikchi) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation] The purpose of cooperative production is to help us in the light industrial sector in supplying people's consumer goods. This is our basic task. The DPRK has reserves of [word indistinct] and guarantees interests for our orders. [end recording]

[(Presov)] In this way, cooperation in the light industrial sector between the two countries is friendly.

In 1987, the DPRK began to produce goods with raw materials supplied by the Soviet Union. [words indistinct] Now, it is easy for us to work. Experience acquired in the course of carrying out the joint work is of help.

Thirty-five enterprises and about 30 subcontracting plants are cooperating with the Soviet technicians. Seventeen million finished goods have been produced in these enterprises and plants (?during the last year). This figure will be increased.

There are still many difficulties to overcome. The quality problem has become pressing in particular. A series of factors, such as poor quality in the raw materials supplied, irregular deliveries of supplies of resources that sometimes stop production, and low-quality containers and packing materials, affect the quality.

During the rainy season, the textile goods and packing materials often get dirty. As a result, the outward appearance of the goods is poor. The loss that results from lowering the price of goods and [word indistinct] is still enormous.

The chaotic supply of power in the DPRK also affects the quality. Despite all this, we believe these are only temporary difficulties.

Introducing new technologies to production, improving the technical process, and gaining experience will eventually bear fruit.

I would like to believe that with the passage of time, new DPRK brands will guarantee the quality and (?workers).

Near East & South Asia

Gorbachev Receives Indian Artist in Kremlin

LD1711230689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast; includes interview with Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev by unidentified correspondent during Gorbachev's meeting with Indian artist Svyatoslav Rerikh in the Kremlin on 17 November—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Today, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva had a meeting in the Kremlin with well-known artist and public figure Svyatoslav Rerikh and his wife Devika Rani. They are in Moscow in connection with the establishment in our country of a Rerikh Foundation and a Nikolay Rerikh center and museum, which will contain the unique and varied heritage of the Rerikh family. [Video shows silver-haired and bearded Rerikh kissing Raisa's hand, then embracing Gorbachev. Mrs Rerikh is greeted by the Gorbachevs. A man with the Rerikhs shakes Gorbachev's hand and says, "I'm very happy to meet you."]

[Gorbachev] I congratulate you cordially.

[Rerikh] Thank you.

[Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, we know this is your second meeting with the Rerikh family, and there is much interest in our country in their cultural and literal legacy. What is your view of the reasons for this interest and how is it planned to preserve this legacy?

[Gorbachev] You know, I think I don't even have to try to prove the importance of this meeting and the uniqueness of these meetings, as they already perhaps are; everything is so clear. In the Rerikh family we have outstanding representatives of our country and people. They are people who have brought glory to our people, people who represent our civilization and its cultural—they are one of its cultural pillars. They are held in very high esteem amongst our people. And so many gestures were made with regard to Russia. I have in mind the father and sons, and we are particularly marking the contribution of Svyatoslav Nikolayevich who has continued this line, this tradition and has achieved much.

But the astonishing thing is that here, in our links with the Rerikh family, India is also present. This is also a unique fact in its own right. You know, this family reflects, as it were, the things that link these two peoples, and I can only say that today these links have assumed such depth and come to involve wide-ranging contacts among people. They truly are very human links. We are proud of this and we value it. So we welcome you (?in this hall). And, as I understand it, today's arrival of Svyatoslav Nikolayevich is intended to put on an operational footing the Rerikh Foundation. Svyatoslav Nikolayevich knows about this government decision. He has made the trip by air specially, although he was a little unwell on the eve of his journey. Nevertheless, he has come. I am very glad, and I thank you.

[Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, we know that you showed much personal interest in seeing the foundation set up.

[Gorbachev] I am convinced it is our duty. It is our common duty. I know that Svyatoslav Nikolayevich—I don't know, he hasn't spoken to me yet, I haven't talked with him, but he has already gone to see and he's heard proposals where the museum and center should be sited.

[Rerikh] We are certain that under your aegis all this will flourish and be expanded, and will bring fresh hopes and some kind of new ways and means not just to our country, but to all mankind. This is already in a fashion manifesting itself now. We can see it in many places, and of course it is a supreme reason for happiness. We know that Mikhail Sergeyevich will carry out his important and, I would say, great work. And this work is precisely what has to be implemented, since it is correct from the evolutionary point of view: It is what people, the people await and want.

[Video shows Rerikh shaking Gorbachev's hand] [Rerikh] I wish you success.

[Gorbachev] Thank you. Thank you. I take those words particularly to heart.

[Rerikh] Yes we know it, we feel it. [video shows brief shot of the Gorbachevs and Rerikhs walking away]

Bhutto Says Mujahidin To Free Soviet POW's

LD2011071889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Islamabad, 20 Nov (TASS)—Pakistan's Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has confirmed the Pakistan Government's intention to help the return home shortly of several Soviet prisoners-of-war captured by the armed Afghan opposition. In an interview published on Sunday the head of the Pakistan Government told the NATION newspaper that the so-called "provisional government" of the mujahidin would release the Soviet prisoners-of-war as a humane gesture. She said that this week there might be a meeting at the Pakistan Foreign Ministry between Soviet representatives and a delegation of the armed Afghan opposition. B. Bhutto did not, however, name a specific day for their release.

According to the NATION at least two Soviet prisoners-of-war are to be released. A spokesman of the mujahidin confirmed that there had been discussions on the question of the release of "two or three" captured Soviet servicemen.

The Pakistani newspaper assesses the actions of its government in this matter as a demonstration of the readiness of the country's present leadership to cooperate with the USSR in the matter of the return home of the Soviet servicemen captured in Afghanistan, out of humanitarian considerations.

Trade Protocol Signed With Syria

LD1711223289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1456 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Damascus, 17 Nov (TASS)—From 11-16 November the second sitting of the subcommission on trade of the standing Soviet-Syrian commission took place in Damascus. The Soviet delegation was headed by V.F. Mordvinov, deputy minister of foreign economic relations, and the Syrian delegation was led by Muhammad al-'Imadi, minister of economy and foreign trade. After the talks a protocol was signed reflecting the realization of the agreement on trade turnover for 1986-1990. It noted that Syria delivered by October of this year goods to the amount of 500 million pounds as liquidation of Soviet credits. They constitute mainly consumer goods (clothes, cloth, knitwear, soap, perfumes, everyday chemical products and food). Correspondingly, the volume of exports from the USSR in the current year has amounted to 50 million pounds.

The sides' concrete tasks for 1990 and measures for further developing trade between the USSR and Syria have been defined by the protocol. A number of questions on technical cooperation have also been discussed. An accord has been reached to start elaborating the next 5-year trade agreement which will be studied at the 11th sitting of the commission.

Mordvinov, who led the Soviet delegation, was received by Salim Yasin, deputy prime minister of Syria for economic affairs, Mustafa Talas, deputy prime minister and minister of defense, and Sabah Baqjaji, chairman of the Syrian side of the commission and minister of state for planning affairs.

Nishanov Receives PLO Envoy in Moscow

LD1411220489 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of Nationalities, today received the Palestine Liberation Organisation representative in Moscow, Nabil M. 'Amr, at his request.

On the instructions of Yasir 'Arafat, president of the Palestinian State and chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, the ambassador conveyed warm greetings and good wishes to the Soviet leadership and personally to Mikhail Gorbachev.

Nishanov and 'Amr thoroughly discussed the Middle East situation, the present state and prospects for settling the Arab-Israeli conflict and a fair solution of the Palestinian problem.

Nishanov reiterated the Soviet Union's firm support for the PLO's realistic and constructive course elaborated at the 19th session of the Palestine National Council.

Expressing satisfaction with Soviet-Palestinian ties, the sides favoured their consolidation and the development of bilateral interaction, above all on the issue of a Middle East settlement.

Ahmad Khomeyni Appointed to Iran Security Council

NC1611110089 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners, as previously reported Ayatollah 'Ali Khamene'i, Iran's religious leader, has appointed Imam Khomeyni's son, Ahmad Khomeyni, as his representative in the National Security Council.

Forty-two year old Hojjat ol-Eslam Ahmad Khomeyni is very popular in Tehran. Even though he did not hold any official position, his name was always [words indistinct].

Ahmad Khomeyni's name appeared for the first time in January 1979. At that time he was not referred to only as Imam Khomeyni's son, but as a political official from among the imam's entourage. During the first years of the Islamic revolution he was usually on the sidelines. But in 1986 his star rapidly began to shine in Iran's political sky. During the latter part of Imam Khomeyni's life, Ahmad Khomeyni was among the (?major figures) in the Iranian hierarchy. He was appointed head of Iran's radio and television and controlled the activities of all the mass media. He also enjoyed extreme rights in the field of propaganda.

His nearness to Imam Khomeyni made Ahmad Khomeyni a popular national personality. Many observers believed that after the death of the founder of the Islamic Republic, his son would claim the highest government position. But this did not happen; Ahmad Khomeyni (?moved in the opposite direction). Namely, he was unable to become a presidential candidate in June this year, but then supported the candidacy of 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. Some time after this, he rejected the proposal to head the Majlis. I wish to recall that 220 Majlis deputies sent a special letter to Ahmad Khomeyni calling on him to accept the post. But Ahmad Khomeyni said he needed time after his father's death to regain his strength to serve the revolution. He also stressed that he would not strive for a position in the Iranian leadership in the near future. In order to prove this point, in August he refused to (?undertake) the post of head of Iran's Voice and Vision. It was even (?implied) that Ahmad Khomeyni wanted to give up political activities for good.

The various rumors on Ahmad Khomeyni's destiny heard in Tehran during the past few months were not accidental. The Iranian press repeatedly tried to determine the position he would take in the government. For example, the press discussed the probability of his candidacy from Tehran for the mid-term Majlis elections to be held on 15 December.

However, recent events show that Ahmad Khomeyni has chosen a completely different path. Today he is striving to become one of the major (?clerics) in the Iranian leadership, as, for example, a member of the Expediency Discernment Council, the duty of which is to solve differences between the Council of Guardians and the Majlis as well as to advise the Iranian leadership on (?various) issues.

He has now become Ayatollah Khamene'i's representative in the Supreme National Security Council. Among his duties will be the compilation of defense and national security policies. Thus, Ahmad Khomeyni continues to participate in all the important political decisions and can also affect these decisions. However, he does not have any direct responsibility as far as Iran's situation is concerned.

At any rate, his current positions provide him the with the opportunity to claim a more active political role in the future.

East Europe

Krenz Discusses Economy, Rules Out Reunification

LD1911233189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Nov 89

[From "Seven Days" newscast]

[Text] [Tikhomirov] Our correspondent in Berlin interviewed Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, chairman of the GDR State Council: [video shows Krenz in anteroom speaking to unidentified correspondent]

[Krenz in German with superimposed Russian translation] In my opinion there is no question of unification, and there cannot be. Stability is the issue in Europe, including in connection with the construction of a common European home. Stability in Europe depends on neighborly relations between the two German states to a large extent, and peace depends on stability in Central Europe to a large extent. For this reason one cannot isolate the question of unification from other very important political problems. I consider that there are no grounds today to discuss this problem.

[Correspondent] Many problems have now arisen from the new rules about trips. How do you think the economic aspects of this problem should be solved?

[Krenz] When the political leadership realizes that the measures they have implemented are in harmony with the desires and will of the people, this is extremely important, and of course comes first. I also realize that in a state where there are two social systems, complex questions arise in such a situation with crossing the border. For that reason our party put forward an initiative for a commission to be formed by the government which would solve all these problems, starting with the question of foreign currency, and ending with problems connected with attempts to buy us up, since prices for basic foodstuffs and some other goods are much lower with us, thanks to state subsidies. But I think we shall find solutions that would express the interests of our citizens, but they will on no account be a return to the time when trips were impossible.

Krenz Criticizes Party Leadership, Honecker

LD1711192789 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin November 17 TASS—"That the country has found itself in a difficult position is not the blame of rank-and-file communists, workers, peasants or intellectuals. Our party's leadership is to blame for that," Socialist Unity Party of Germany Party leader and Chairman of the GDR Council of State Egon Krenz told journalists between sessions of the GDR People's Chamber here.

"Former party leader Erich Honecker also bears personal responsibility for the mistakes. But considering his age and health, he should be given the right to decide himself when to make a public assessment of his actions," Krenz stressed.

"We are accomplishing a peaceful revolution. And I am glad and happy to see our people are aware of that. While in the street they do not forget about work. This is most important, since revolution is impossible without work," Krenz said.

GDR's Modrow on Economic, Political Reforms

LD1711195889 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin November 17 TASS— The most important task of the new Government of the GDR which will include representatives of all the five political parties functioning in the country is to overcome the crisis of the national economy of the German Democratic Republic, to impart stability to the national economy and give it an impetus for growth.

GDR Prime-Minister Hans Modrow said this in a policy statement he delivered at a session of the People's Chamber of the GDR that opened in Berlin today.

The prime-minister said that the priority reforms to be carried out under the government programme include the reforms of the political system connected with measures in legislation, economic transformations, as well as reforms in the areas of education and government. This requires the reduction of the number of Cabinet members from 44 to 28.

The head of the GDR Government said that the economic reform does not mean the elimination of a planned economy. But the government must now proceed clearly from the view that the market with its commodity-money relations should become part of a socialist planned economy.

A better socialism must give the opportunity to everyone to build a rich, fulfilling life. Political and ideological tolerance is an essential ingredient, Modrow said.

A question of vital importance for the [word indistinct] of the GDR is foreign economic stability. Cooperation with the Soviet Union is the top guarantee for the further development of the GDR's economy, he said.

As regards the tasks of the country's foreign policy, Modrow emphasised that the republic adheres to its commitments under the Warsaw Treaty. It will take part in the analysis of the situation in the CMEA and will make constructive and realistic proposals.

The German Democratic Republic is also striving for an earlier establishment of relations of cooperation with the European Community.

Modrow favoured stable, predictable relations between the two German states, their further constructive development.

He said new reality in the GDR clearly refutes unrealistic as well as dangerous speculation about reunification.

Notes Need for 'Greater Democracy'

LD1811230189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Yuriy Rostov] Good evening. Events in the European socialist countries have been at the center of the world community's attention for at least the past 2 weeks. Today has been no exception. The new GDR Government was sworn in today.

[Correspondent V. Lyubovtsev] A session of the People's Chamber, the GDR's supreme organ of state authority, has been underway for 2 days here at the Palace of the Republic. For 2 days both the country and the world have attentively followed the course of the discussions, because a new government has been taking shape which is to lead the construction of a socialist German state at the current, particularly complex—one could say sharp—turning point in history. Renewal—in one word—that's how the new government's program can be defined, renewal in politics, economics, the social sphere, all social life.

[Correspondent V. Mostovoy] The new GDR Government, which includes representatives of all five political parties operating in the country, is to become a coalition of a political alliance that has virtually been created afresh. And it's no coincidence that the representation of the bloc parties in the new ministerial Cabinet has increased almost fourfold. In our view, this fact shows the real possibilities of socialist pluralism in a new light and reflects the specifities of development of the German Democratic Republic. However paradoxical it may appear at first glance, it will be a scaled-down government which will perform the very complex tasks facing the country. Its number has been reduced from 44, to 28 members. In a statement at the GDR People's Chamber session, Hans Modrow, the new prime minister, said that cooperation with the Soviet Union is the guarantee of further development for the republic's national economy. And as the first expression of confidence in the government and in its actions, Hans Modrow, the head of the Cabinet, said in his first meeting with journalists tonight that the participants in the student demonstrations, which have been taking place near the Palace of the Republic during this period, gave him a letter.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Comrade Chairman of the Council of Ministers, which of the tasks facing the government do you consider to be the main one?

[Modrow] That's a difficult question, of course. It's my opinion that in our country—as in yours—greater democracy is the main thing, and that means greater socialism. And the government must be closer to the people. Those will be our main tasks. [end recording]

GDR Citizens 'Try Out' New Cross-Border Travel

LD1411210189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Excerpts] We are receiving reports that people from the GDR are continuing to try out their new opportunities to visit or cross the border between the GDR and the FRG.

Our correspondent reports that over 3 million people from the GDR have already visited the FRG and West Berlin over the weekend. Here then is Anatoliy Stepkin with the details:

[Stepkin] Esteemed listeners, to help you picture this figure let me say that the lines of vehicles on the roads and highways leading to Berlin and the crossing points on the border stretched for 45 kilometers. [passage omitted]

The authorities and public organizations in West Berlin tried to create a holiday atmosphere. What did these 2 days show? That the fears that many GDR citizens would want to stay in the West were vain, for 99 percent of them returned to the GDR after they had visited the FRG and West Berlin. In answer to journalists' questions, most of them said this: The GDR is my home; my family is here and so are my relatives, friends and work.

Furthermore, many of those who left the republic in the preceding weeks through the territory of Hungary or Czechoslovakia have decided to return home. From now on anyone who wants to go abroad can obtain a visa without any particular difficulty and go where he wishes. New crossing points are being set up for people to go over the border.

The GDR has entered a new era, an era of free and more humane socialism.

Implications of New GDR Travel Rules

LD1411151989 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] New regulations introduced by the GDR have eased freedom of movement along its borders with West Germany and West Berlin. The recent move by the East German Government has been welcomed in the Soviet Union and is seen as a bold and sensible step putting an end to old dogmas. The decision is in line with the processes started off by Soviet perestroyka and reforms in socialist countries elsewhere. It could also be seen as new evidence of the new political thinking pursued by the Soviet Union and its allies put into practice.

In the meantime President Gorbachev's message to President Bush voices support to the crucial reform now underway in the GDR, expressing hope that the situation in Europe would remain calm and peaceful.

The widespread response to the current developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe show that these changes have been making a favorable impact on the international environment, including Soviet-American relations. And in this respect the latest reports from the GDR have become a new hopeful sign.

For many years the GDR's regulations operating at its border with West Germany and West Berlin have been described as nothing short of a major stumbling block to East-West normalization. Meanwhile Washington always held the Berlin Wall to be the barrier to its relations with the Soviet Union. Now with the barrier gone on the GDR's initiative, it's to be hoped that the event would have a favorable effect on next month's summit meeting in the Mediterranean between the Soviet and American presidents.

At any rate, President Bush and Chancellor Kohl of West Germany, who were speaking on the line on Friday [10 November] have both agreed that the summit would be even more important. Mr Bush is quoted as saying on Thursday that when he meets Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev he will discuss additional steps to help spur change in Eastern Europe, including possible restoration of long-denied U.S. trade benefits.

Sadly, different statements could also be heard in America. Now that the old stereotypes of the Iron Curtain period are on the way out it would seem those of military confrontation should go too. Mr (Raymond Kardoff) of the Brookings Institution, for one, said: I'm sure there will be increased difficulty in getting public support for higher defense budgets.

Clearly there are many in the West who have a faint idea of the common Europe [as heard] home in which security of all and each would be based on trust, understanding and cooperation, rather than on armories. And the decision by the GDR Government on new regulations from freedom of movement by its nationals does certainly contribute towards a common European home.

SED Preparations for December Congress Noted

PM1711150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch under general heading "Life of Fraternal Parties": "SED: Preparing for Congress"]

[Text] Berlin—Preparations are under way in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] for the extraordinary party congress to be held in mid-December. The SED Central Committee Consultation and Information Center opened today. Its aim, a report published in the newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND states, is to promote the development of democracy and openness in the party's life. It is open every day. SED members, party collectives, and individual interested citizens can use it.

The report lists the center's tasks. They are to accept proposals, pieces of advice, and criticisms with regard to the extraordinary congress, to promote direct contacts between the party masses and the Central Committee, and to conduct a discussion about specific steps along the road of renewal in the spirit of the SED action program.

The process of party renewal started in SED local organizations. Cadre questions are above all at the center of attention. Bezirk committee plenums have been held to

elect new first secretaries of all bezirk committees. In Suhl Bezirk a decision was made to hold an extraordinary party conference to elect a new bezirk committee.

The face of the party press is changing. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND reports that, as of today, its editorial board will be under a new leader. Wolfgang Spickermann has become chief editor, and the editorial collegium has been renewed.

An address to readers signed by the chief editor states that it is a question of new content, large amounts of information, political assessments, and modern journalistic forms. The newspaper will serve the democratic shaping of the party's will.

Reportage on 17 Nov Prague Demonstration

Description of Events

LD1811094989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 18 Nov 89

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy]

[Text] Prague, 18 Nov (TASS)—An unsanctioned youth demonstration took place in Prague late in the evening of 17 November. It was preceded by a meeting, permitted by the authorities, which was devoted to the November 1939 events, when the Nazi police fired on a students' demonstration. The meeting passed under political, mainly antigovernment, slogans, along with demands for deepening restructuring processes in the country. Those who had gathered disrupted an address by representatives of the Socialist Youth Union, stating that they demand an open, honest dialogue.

After the meeting the crowd made for the Vysehrad cemetery in order to lay flowers at the graves of Czech cultural figures buried there. Passions became inflamed. Students and the citizens who had joined them—up to 25,000 people—chanted slogans demanding free elections, the resignation of the government, and the release of political prisoners. According to a CTK report, "some well-known figures of the times of the 1968-69 political crisis wanted to use the meeting for their own purposes."

After the meeting a column many-thousands strong carrying candles and banners made for Wenceslas Square chanting: "Czechs, don't be afraid. Come with us." On the approaches to the square the demonstration was dispersed by the forces of law and order.

Claim of 'Disinformation'

LD1911215289 Moscow TASS in English 2138 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 20 TASS—The official Czechoslovak news agency CTK denied on Sunday Western media reports that one or even several demonstrators might have died of injuries after the November 17 protest march in Prague.

This is an intentional spreading of disinformation which does not correspond to reality, the agency said

Not a single demonstrator was seriously hurt and no one died, it assured.

The Czechoslovak Interior Ministry said that false information was being disseminated since the Saturday of November 18. The reports were being broadcast by the Voice of America radio station which claimed that a 20-year-old mathematics student named Martin Smid had died in hospital after being beaten by riot police during the November 17 protest.

This is an intentional manipulation of public conscience designed to whip up passions and hostile sentiments.

Among the injured there is no person of the name of Martin Smid and no person of that name died on November 18, the ministry's report said.

Education Minister Jana Synkova told CTK that a student named Martin Smid did indeed take part in the demonstration but was not injured, is in good health and will continue studying as usual on Monday.

The dean of the University's Mathematical and Physics Department talked to him and his parents. Another student of the department also named Smid is also in good health; he did not take part in the protest.

Czechoslovak health minister informed CTK that data from medical institutions and emergency treatment centres shows that none of the students was seriously hurt in Prague.

A total of 36 persons have been treated for light injuries. ten of them remain in hospital.

Denial of Student Death

LD2011080989 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 20 TASS—Frantisek Pitra, head of the Government of the Czech Socialist Republic, appeared on Czechoslovak Television on Sunday night [19 October] in connection with recent developments.

"Our Czechoslovak way of restructuring and democratisation, launched two years ago and based on our own historical and current experience and on the experience of other socialist countries, is not to the liking of some forces at home and abroad. They use every possibility to destabilise and frustrate current reforms," he emphasised.

"Those circles used for their own purposes the situation that developed following the mourning demonstration of Prague students on November 17.

"Misinformation that one student allegedly died as a result of intervention by security forces should arouse

everyone's indignation. This proves that the organisers of provocations do not disdain anything and that there is nothing sacred for them.

"I state with full responsibility that there is nothing truthful in the rumours that are being spread. Apart from the security forces, there were no other armed units present during the demonstration," Pitra said.

"Mendacious and deliberately spread rumours that people were allegedly killed or seriously injured have had their effect on many people, unfortunately.

"The consequence of the strained atmosphere is also an announcement by some theatres that they have postponed their performances for an indefinite period. In their statement they call for protest strikes and other forms of resistance, support anonymous calls for student strikes and other unreasonable steps.

"Unrest and chaos cannot be our programme. No extremities or ill-considered steps can lead society forward. An overwhelming majority of our people are interested in tranquil development.

"The difficult tasks facing us call for the full mustering of everyone's energies, creativity, prudence and civic responsibility," Pitra emphasised.

CSSR Bans 1-2 Day East Bloc Visits

PM1711140389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Second Edition p 7

[PRAVDA-TASS report under general heading "News in Brief"]

[Text] The Czechoslovak Government today unilaterally decided to rescind its agreements and contracts for 1-2 day trips to the CSSR by tourist groups from Hungary, Poland, the USSR, and the SFRY. According to a government statement, the decision was based on negative phenomena linked with speculation and bulk purchases of goods on the Czechoslovak market. This measure will remain in force until the end of the first half of next year. Exchange trips arranged within the framework of cooperation between enterprises are also being broken off for the same period.

Medvedev Receives CSSR's Fojtik 17 Nov

LD1811095689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0013 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From "Novosti" program]

[Text] Comrade Medvedev met [on 17 November] with [Jan] Fojtik, a member of the Presidium and a secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee.

Belousov Meets CSSR Metallurgy Minister

PM1711151589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS "Official Announcement"]

[Text] On 13 November USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman I.S. Belousov received L. Vodrazka, Czechoslovak deputy premier and minister of metallurgy, machine building, and electrical engineering, who was on a short working visit to the Soviet Union.

Czechoslovak Ambassador to the USSR I. Rehorek participated in the conversation.

CSSR Leaders Thank USSR for Greetings

PM1711142189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[CSSR leaders thank USSR leaders for anniversary greetings]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades,

We thank you sincerely for the congratulations on the 71st anniversary of the forming of an independent Czechoslovak state.

We receive with satisfaction your high appraisal of the successes our people have achieved in the postwar period buttressed by the alliance, friendship, and fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union.

We are convinced that our traditionally good relations and mutually beneficial cooperation, which have been developing during the implementation of the restructuring tasks common to our countries, will promote the fuller realization of the advantages of socialism and the enhancement of its prestige throughout the world.

Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee
Gustav Husak, president of the CSSR
Ladislav Adamec, premier of the CSSR

Bulgarian Politburo, Other Personnel Changes

LD1711140889 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Sofia November 17 TASS—The determination to pursue a policy for the renewal of socialism on the basis of democratisation, openness and the responsibility shared by all for the future of Bulgaria was cited at a plenary meeting of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) Central Committee here.

On the suggestion of Petur Mladenov, general secretary of the party's Central Committee, the plenum effected a number of personnel changes on the Politburo and the Secretariat.

A proposal about the current need to combine the duties of the general secretary of the party's Central Committee and the president of Bulgaria's Council of State was substantiated.

On behalf of the party's parliamentary group, the proposal will be submitted to the People's Assembly for consideration. The candidacy of Mladenov will be offered for the post.

The plenum relieved Grisha Filipov, Milko Balev and Dimitur Stoyanov of their duties as Politburo members and secretaries of the party's Central Committee and removed them from the Central Committee. It also suggested that Bulgaria's Peoples Assembly relieve them of their duties as members of Bulgaria's Council of State.

Petko Danchev was relieved of his duties as an alternate member of the Politburo and removed from the BCP Central Committee.

Stoyan Ovcharov was relieved of his duties as an alternate member of the Politburo. Vasil Tsanov and Emil Khristov were relieved of their duties as secretaries of the party's Central Committee. Vladimir Zhivkov, Nikola Stefanov and Khristo Maleev were removed from the Central Committee.

The plenary meeting cancelled the decisions dated July and December of 1988 on the removal of Stoyan Mikhaylov and Svetlin Rusev from the party's Central Committee. Nacho Papazov, chairman of the party's Control and Auditing Commission, was co-opted into the Central Committee.

The plenum elected Andrey Lukanov and Nacho Papazov Politburo members and secretaries of the party's Central Committee, and suggested that the People's Assembly elect them to Bulgaria's Council of State. Mincho Yovchev and Panteley Pachov were elected Politburo members.

The plenum relieved Politburo member Yordan Yotov of his duties as a secretary of the party's Central Committee.

Dimitur Stanishev and Ivan Stanev, secretaries of the party's Central Committee, were elected alternate members of the Politburo. Prodan Stoyanov was elected secretary of the party's Central Committee.

New Bulgarian Leader Addresses Parliament

LD1711205189 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Sofia November 17 TASS—By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Stepanenko and Andrey Chupakhin:

A session of the Bulgarian National Assembly was held here today. Deputies unanimously elected Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) General Secretary Petur Mladenov president of the Bulgarian Council of State.

Deputies relieved Todor Zhivkov of this post. Substantiating their decision, they heavily censured the authoritarian style of the past leadership which was distinguished for its crude voluntarism, self-conceit and nepotism.

They condemned numerous concepts and reorganisations which have inflicted a serious damage on the country's economy.

Addressing the session, Mladenov noted that he regards his election to the presidency at this difficult period for the country as a vote of confidence to the restructuring in the country, mapped out by the November (1989) plenary meeting of the BCP Central Committee.

"Our society is on the threshold of a new stage of its development," he emphasised. The foundations of the command-bureaucratic system are cracking with every passing day, and new changes are being felt in the political atmosphere.

Attention is increasingly being focussed on ordinary people.

Then Mladenov dealt with the place, role and activities of the National Assembly. He stressed that the Bulgarian Parliament should quickly reorganise its work in order to guarantee the development of society, social and economic interests, freedoms and rights of Bulgarian citizens in the incoming difficult period.

People expect that parliament will adopt such directions of domestic and foreign policies which will ensure stability, security and cooperation in the international arena and unity of the nation.

Deputies made a decision on changes in the composition of the Bulgarian national assembly, the structure and composition of the government, the composition of the commission for drafting a bill on changes in the Bulgarian Constitution.

They also approved bills on amnesty and changes in the republic's penal code.

Thousands at Bulgarian Rally for Glasnost

LD1811221189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Thousands participated in a mass meeting today in the Bulgarian capital. The rally was called by unofficial public organizations. Our correspondent Viktor Samarin reports from Sofia:

[Samarin] Among all the banners, placards, and slogans, a group of young people unfurled a huge sheet which

said: The morning of Soviet perestroyka has awakened Bulgaria—Let's synchronize our watches, Soviet brothers!

The mood of the thousands of people and their attitude to what has happened in the country in the past 8 days—since the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee leadership was changed, the composition of the government has been rejuvenated, and sober assessments of the state of affairs in Bulgarian society have been aired from the highest party and state platforms—and finally the people's hopes and demands for the future could today be learned by listening to the speeches and reading the homemade slogans, some angry and some joking, fluttering over the throng of people outside Aleksandr Nevskiy Cathedral. I will cite just a few of them: Gorbachev and Mladenov are the hopes for democracy; Freedom of the press and respect for human dignity; Bring those guilty of the lawlessness to account; Glasnost without limit—Corruption and crime behind bars. And this placard provoked a gale of laughter on the square: Todor Zhivkov for ambassador to Bulgaria. As the man who unfurled this placard and who identified himself as Stoyan explained to me, it refers to the libertarianism [as heard] of the former leader in tackling the problem of the Bulgarian Muslims, which had dramatic consequences for many families.

By and large, I should note that the atmosphere at the rally was happy. A spirit of optimism and unity prevailed on the square. Prominent academics and cultural artists, the elderly, and still quite young activists in public movements all spoke—people who just a week ago were not infrequently regarded as antipatriotic. This is our country, said one of the speakers, and its prosperity depends on each one of us. Our choice is a democratic and humane socialism. We will remind ourselves of this choice, made in September 1945. We welcome the departure of leaders who did not know how to reach this objective.

Dismantling of Zhivkov Power Network Urged

LD1811231189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Yu. Rostov, in studio] On the line is our Sofia correspondent Dmitriy Golovanov. Good evening. What's the situation like today in Sofia and Bulgaria in general?

[Golovanov] It wasn't easy getting to the Bulgarian TV studio. Everything's surrounded by crowds of people. The main event of the outgoing week was the party Central Committee plenum. Zhivkov's closest assistants were removed from their posts as members of the Central Committee, the Secretariat, and the Politburo, and Vladimir Zhivkov, the former leader's son, was also removed from the party's Central Committee. Quite recently, against the will of the public, he was appointed head of the party Central Committee Culture Department. Petko Danchev, another of Zhivkov's relatives, who had a meteoric career move, was removed from the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Rostov] Along with our correspondent in the Sofia studio is Nikola Mileshkov, a well-known Bulgarian political scientist, who was still recently in disfavor. This question is for him: Is there any guarantee that today's changes in Bulgaria are irreversible?

[Mileshkov] The regime of personified power of Todor Zhivkov's family is an entire system, a system that must be completely dismantled so that it does not remain even after its leader has departed. Perestroyka must embrace the whole of society, from politics and ideology to, of course, the economy. I am certain that we have sufficient healthy forces for our society to get out of the state in which, regrettably, it has found itself for so long. [video shows large crowd of people in streets, some holding banners; policemen looking on; interview in studio with Mileshkov]

Bulgarians Await 'Tangible Results' From Reform

PM1711212189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch: "Bulgaria: Long-Awaited Renewal"]

[Text] Sofia—A plenum of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee has been held in Sofia, at which P. Mladenov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee, proposed immediate cadre changes. The plenum decided to relieve influential figures of the recent past like G. Filipov, M. Balev, and D. Stoyanov of their duties as members of the Politburo and secretaries of the Central Committee, and to expel them from the Central Committee. The plenum elected A. Lukanov and N. Papazov members of the Politburo and secretaries of the BCP Central Committee. M. Yovchev and N. Pachov, first secretaries of Khaskovo and Plovdiv Oblast party committees respectively, were also elected members of the Politburo.

All speakers at the plenum noted that it is difficult to advance without cadre changes. It was emphasized that the new political course of genuine perestroyka is a prerequisite for overcoming the accumulated dissatisfaction and tension among a sizeable proportion of society. Determination was expressed to undeviatingly pursue a line of renewal of socialism in the country on the basis of democratization, glasnost, and every person's responsibility for the country's future. There was frank talk about the enthusiasm and joy with which the people welcomed the radical change effected on 10 November.

Initial data from a public opinion poll indicate that never before has any political event produced such a response. There is an overwhelming opinion that the election of the new general secretary marks the beginning of a new period in the country's life, and it is noted that

there has been a pressing need for this for a long time. At the same time, a small number of people polled expressed the fear that "the one-man method of leadership which was typical hitherto could be carried over under the new conditions."

All those polled, without exception, made a negative appraisal of the situation in which Bulgaria finds itself: "Our country is in a crisis, and responsibility for this rests with the top leadership." First and foremost, it is necessary to overcome the steadily growing shortages of prime necessities; there is need for separation of the functions of party and state power, broad pluralism of opinions, and free democratic elections at all levels. There are demands "to put an end to family mafia privileges which have grown roots in all social spheres," to "special supply services," and to "official cars, residences, and villas."

As regards people's readiness to participate in the processes of renewal, the predominant attitude is one of wait and see. The reasons lie in mistrust as regards promised changes which, for years on end, never went beyond the framework of empty declarations. At the same time, the opinion poll shows that "if people sense tangible results from perestroyka, they are ready to join in much more actively."

Gusev Discusses Cooperation With Bulgarians

Received by Mladenov, Atanasov

LD1611121889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1924 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Sofia, 15 November—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Stepanenko reports: Petur Mladenov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP], today received Vladimir Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is in Bulgaria in connection with the 33d sitting of the intergovernmental Soviet-Bulgarian Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation taking place here.

P. Mladenov informed the Soviet guest of the steps the party leadership of the People's Republic of Bulgaria [PRB] is taking to make the processes of perestroyka in the country more dynamic and deeper in the spirit of the decisions of the November (1989) Plenum of the Central Committee of the BCP.

The common conviction was expressed that the processes of renewal in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union are creating favorable prerequisites for the further rising development of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation. Questions connected with the prospects of economic interaction between the two fraternal countries were examined in a constructive spirit.

The same day, V.K. Gusev was received by Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRB. There was an exchange of opinions on the course of the economic reforms in the two countries and on the problems arising in the process of their implementation, and also on the new possibilities for the development of bilateral economic cooperation. At the meeting attention was paid to the concrete questions of the coordination of plans for the development of barter between the two countries for the 1991-1995 period.

Andrey Lukanov, minister of foreign economic relations of the PRB and chairman of the Bulgarian section of the intergovernmental Soviet-Bulgarian commission on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, and also Viktor V. Sharapov, ambassador of the USSR to the PRB, were present at the meetings.

Attends Cooperation Meeting

LD1611123189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2013 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Sofia, 15 November (TASS)—In Sofia a routine, the 33d, sitting of the intergovernmental Soviet-Bulgarian Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation has taken place. Most important questions touching upon the development of economic cooperation between the USSR and the PRB [People's Republic of Bulgaria] in the current and the next five-year-plan, including the course of the work to coordinate state plans between the USSR and the PRB for 1991-1995 at the level of central planning and scientific and technical bodies and also of the sectoral ministries and departments of both countries, were examined at the sitting. Measures were outlined to accelerate the carrying out of this work at the level of sectors, enterprises, and firms.

The participants in the sitting noted that the development of production and scientific and technical cooperation at the level of economic links and the joint implementation of major production projects should become a considerable reserve for expanding foreign economic ties and mutual barter betweeen the USSR and the PRB. The stages and procedure for carrying out work to develop the economic mechanism of cooperation between both countries were defined. Measures were agreed for implementation of the mutual obligations of the sides in the deliveries of goods in 1989 and in the preparation of a protocol on barter and payments between the USSR and the PRB for 1990. The commission examined the state and prospects of the development of new forms of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation and outlined further measures for raising the efficiency of economic interaction at the level of enterprises and firms and of other Soviet and Bulgarian organizations.

In the course of the work of the commission, members of the Soviet and Bulgarian delegations visited a number of Bulgarian enterprises manufacturing consumer goods and outlined plans for the further development of cooperation in this sphere.

The sitting of the commission took place in a constructive spirit providing for a mutually acceptable solution to the questions examined.

K. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, headed the Soviet delegation and Andrey Lukanov, candidate member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the BCP and minister of foreign economic relations of the PRB, headed the Bulgarian delegation.

Bulgaria's Mladenov Receives Bazovskiy

LD1611201989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee, received Vladimir Bazovskiy, first deputy chairman of the Central Board of the Soviet-Bulgarian Friendship Society and member of the CPSU Central Committee. During the conversation an exchange of views on further deepening friendship between the two peoples took place.

CPSU Central Committee Greets RCP Congress

PM2011150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

["Greetings to Romanian Communist Party Congress"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends ardent greetings to the delegates of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress.

The CPSU values relations with the Romanian Communists developing on the basis of the principles of noninterference, equal rights, and mutual interest in each other's successes. The comparison of views and opinions and the exchange of experience of work help to give meaning to ways of revealing the humanist potential of socialism, on which the progress of each fraternal country and the attractiveness of the socialist idea in the world depend. Convinced that cooperation between the CPSU and the RCP serves the interests of the two countries' peoples and the cause of the struggle for peace and socialism, we affirm our readiness to deepen and enrich it.

We wish the Communists and all working people of Romania successes in the country's socioeconomic development, happiness, and prosperity.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

Vorotnikov Departs for Romanian Party Congress

LD1911094789 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 19 TASS—A CPSU delegation led by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo and president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, left for Bucharest at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party.

The delegation will take part in the 14th Congress of the Romanian Communist Party, which opens on November 20.

Arrives in Bucharest 19 Nov

LD1911122989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1158 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Bucharest, 19 Nov (TASS)—Today a CPSU delegation headed by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived in Bucharest at the invitation of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee. The delegation will take part in the work of the 14th RCP Congress which opens on 20 November.

The delegation was met at the airport by M. Dobrescu, member of the Executive Political Committee of the RCP Central Committee and chairman of the General Trade Union Federation of Romania, and by other officials.

Romanian Economic Situation Viewed

LD1911000289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent Sergey Zheleznyak in Bucharest]

[Text] The chief question on the agenda of these meetings and conferences is approval of the decision of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee plenum to reelect Nicolae Ceausescu as RCP general secretary and discussion of the program of directives and theses for the congress. These documents contain an analysis of the path that the country has traversed and the directions of its development for the 5-year period, and the long-term prospects up to the years 2000-2010. [video shows street scenes, people shopping, store windows]

Romania's great achievement of recent years has been the complete liquidation of its foreign debt. The economy, propaganda, and foreign policy were subordinated to resolving this task; industry and agriculture, state enterprises, and cooperatives worked to achieve it. The world market constantly demanded an increase in quality, and this was attained, to a large degree at the cost of weakening the domestic consumer market, where the quality of consumer goods fell. Harsh measures to economize on raw materials, food produce, heat and electricity were introduced everywhere. The positive balance in Romania's foreign trade in freely convertible currency reached record figures—over 4 billion dollars. Great hopes were linked in Romania with paying off the foreign debt. And indeed, changes have recently

occurred in the country. Meat, butter, sausage and eggs have started appearing in the shops more often, though the shops are still limited as before. It has got a bit lighter in towns in the evenings, though the winter will show much success has been achieved in overcoming the energy problem.

Poland's Rakowski Discusses German Reunification

LD1811225889 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Warsaw November 19 TASS—Polish concepts of national security must be oriented to the future, Polish communist leader Mieczyslaw Rakowski told the PAP news agency.

"It is necessary to constantly think of a real, specific doctrine based on correct forecasts of events that may happen in neighbouring countries, in the West, the East and all parts of the European Continent," he said.

"Despite the fashion for anti-Sovietism, which has grown in Poland of late, it is necessary to say clearly that the processes taking place west of Poland require that the Polish authorities rely to a still greater extent on the military-political alliance with the Soviet Union.

"The opening of the border between East and West Germany has been the most important event since the foundation of both German states.

"In the period of its construction, the Berlin Wall reflected the specific sociopolitical and economic situation in postwar Europe.

"Now a new situation has emerged both in Poland and in the whole of Europe. It is bringing a number of difficult problems requiring the adaptation of existing political doctrines to them to ensure the inviolability of Polish national interests.

"The visit by West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to Poland should have been a turning-point in relations between the two countries, but this did not happen.

"The West German stand lacked an unambiguous statement that a future united German state will establish its borders along the rivers Oder and Nysa.

"This did not take place, although Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki proposed that the chancellor make an unambiguous statement on this issue, which is the main condition for full confidence of the Polish side in West Germany.

"This is why the issue of reunification of the two Germanies will invariably be a subject of discussions on Western borders and, hence, a problem of Poland's territorial integrity.

"If someone thinks that talk of a united, free, and peaceful Europe will replace for Poland the guarantees given to it by the alliance with the Soviet Union and by the presence of Soviet divisions on the Elbe, he displays an extreme political naivete," Rakowski emphasised.

Protocol Dispute Blocks Rakowski-Kohl Meeting

PM1711150189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Item from roundup of TASS, REUTER, UPI reports: "Statement by Spokesman of Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee"]

[Text] Bistyga, press spokesman of the PZPR Central Committee, has given the reasons why the planned meeting between H. Kohl, currently visiting Poland, and M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, did not take place.

The FRG chancellor, the spokesman said, wanted M. Rakowski to visit him at the residence assigned to him in Warsaw. Our attitude to this was negative because it is at variance with generally accepted international principles. The PZPR Central Committee first secretary pays visits to heads of state. Meetings with countries' prime minsters and other politicians take place at the PZPR Central Committee building. FRG Chancellor H. Kohl categorically refused to come to the PZPR Central Committee. The answer to our proposal to try and find a way out of the prevailing situation was also negative.

Soviet-Polish Party Perestroyka Seminar Ends

LD1611115389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1358 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Warsaw, 15 Nov (TASS)—A bilateral Soviet-Polish seminar dedicated to contemporary problems of perestroyka in the party has ended in Serock, near the Polish capital. Slawomir Wiatr and Wlodzimierz Natorf, secretaries of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee; executives of the CPSU Central Committee and the PZPR; and representatives of scientific and party establishments participated.

During the exchange of opinions that took place, the role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the changing political system of socialism, economic policies, and the transformation of the functions and structure of the party under contemporary conditions were discussed.

Poland's Independence Day Commemorated

Greetings Sent to Polish Leaders

PM1511164589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Soviet leadership bodies' message congratulating Polish leaders on independence anniversary]

[Text] To Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Polish People's Republic

To Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers

We send you and the entire Polish people friendly congratulations on the 71st anniversary of the restoration of Poland's state independence.

The revival of statehood opened up before the Polish people the prospect of independent, autonomous development. Real socioeconomic and sociopolitical transformations have been implemented in the country over the past decades, and the Polish state, acquiring sovereignty over primordially Polish lands, has occupied a worthy place in the world community. Poland's path has also been marked by considerable difficulties.

The friendship between our countries' peoples has long, strong traditions. The Soviet Union seeks to continue developing friendly, good-neighborly relations with Poland on the principles of freedom of choice, equality, and mutually advantageous cooperation—which accords with the interests of the Soviet Union and, we are convinced, of the Polish People's Republic.

We wish you and the entire Polish people successes in resolving the tasks facing the country, peace, and prosperity.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

'Difficult Period' Seen

PM1411152989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Road of Independence"]

[Excerpt] Warsaw—[passage omitted] Last year, for the first time after a long hiatus, the Polish People's Republic marked Independence Day as a national holiday. This year it is being marked in a situation where, after the 4 June Sejm and Senate elections, the republic has entered the stage of the development of parlimentary democracy, and the government is headed by a noncommunist for the first time in postwar history, on the basis of the voters' mandate. The country, which is in the grip of an unprecedented economic crisis, is going through a difficult period. Frequently people try to explain this as the burdensome legacy inherited allegedly from the times of Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] rule. It does not pass, either, without the achievements of the postwar decades being questioned by representatives of the former opposition. A caricaturist has depicted this situation rather cleverly in the following sketch: One guy says to another: "During the past 40 years nothing has been achieved." To which the other replies: "And now we are going to turn this 'nothing' into private property!"

The newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU writes in its holiday edition: "Giving the creators of the Second Republic their due and reviewing its values, the left-wing forces in Poland do not forget for a minute that its independent existence was based on the labor of millions of people. This labor, not always used to the best advantage, and not always remunerated according to its merit, was the main capital of the reborn Poland."

Festive events and concerts marking the anniversary were held in Warsaw 11 November. They also included a ceremonial changing of the guard at the tomb of the unknown soldier, in which republic leaders and thousands of the capital's inhabitants and guests took part.

Watching this ceremony, I thought about the changing of the guard at the helm of the ship of state. Will it give people the chance for a better future? That hope lives in their hearts.

Jaruzelski Cited on Local Authorities' Tasks

PM1711141789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS dispatch: "Steering Course of Reforms. W. Jaruzelski on Self-Management Tasks"]

[Text] Warsaw, 16 Nov—In order to ensure the success of reforms, what Poland needs especially now is stability, accord, and efforts to ensure that, regardless of all differences, the supreme interests of the people and the state remain the paramount criterion always, President W. Jaruzelski of Poland has said. He was speaking at a meeting with voivodship people's council chairmen from all over Poland which was devoted to the situation in the country and the planned reforms in the system of local self-management. The meeting was attended by Sejm and Senate Marshals M. Kozakiewicz and A. Stelmachowski and many members of the government.

The Polish president noted that certain successes have been achieved in the work of the people's councils, which are clearing the way for new decisions and the transition to a new mode of operation on the basis of practical activity. In his opinion, the next elections to the organs of local self-management should be held in July or fall of 1990.

W. Jaruzelski called on people's council deputies to discharge their duties, despite the prevailing difficulties, despite feeling bitter at the fact that their responsible and often difficult and thankless work is not always appreciated as it should be. Nonetheless, at a time when it is necessary to mobilize all forces to overcome difficulties, the activeness of these social organs, which are called upon to set the tone in administrative work and win public support for the reform processes, must not be allowed to slacken.

Dwelling on the question of social initiatives, W. Jaruzelski expressed support for the proposals to set up within the framework of the presidential office a specific organizational structure for social initiatives. Peoples councils also have an important role to play in ensuring a harmonious correlation between the enhancement of production efficiency and social justice and in the

struggle with various unhealthy phenomena inevitable during a period of profound reforms, the Polish president noted.

Solidarity Government Target for Complaints

PM1511122189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[M. Tretyakov article in response to reader's question under rubric "Dialogue": "Poland's Problems"; first two paragraphs are reader's question]

[Text] "I am following the events in Poland's political life with great attention. It seems to me that the administrative edict style of the Polish United Workers' Party [PZPR] has been replaced by dictatorship of the "Solidarity" trade union association. What is this—a new form of democracy in a socialist country? Does this suit the Polish people?

Yuriy Alekseyev, Moscow.

Since the June parliamentary elections the current Polish Government has been headed by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, who expresses the views of "Solidarity." Its representatives have the overwhelming majority of posts in the cabinet. Legally "Solidarity" remains a trade union, as was determined in the course of its registration. But in reality it has the role of a political movement with all the resulting consequences, including responsibility for the country's future.

Poland's current political life is eventful. Numerous initiative groups ranging from extreme left to extreme right are being formed which have put forward their programs and are ready to become political parties at any moment. Various independent publications reflecting the opinions of certain social groups have appeared. A sharp precongress discussion is going on in the PZPR about the future party model. Several opposing groupings are operating within "Solidarity."

At the same time Poland is experiencing serious economic difficulties. The working people's living standard is falling, prices are rising fast, the deep economic imbalance persists, and society is being further divided into rich and poor. Evaluating the material situation of workers' families, the newspaper ZYCIE WARSZAWY recently wrote that while in 1985 many people were optimistic and had hopes for a better future, this is not the case today. In 1987, according to specialists' estimations, 2 percent of society was living below the poverty line. Today the figure is 20 percent.

What measures is the current government taking to improve the worsening economic situation? Its program proposes to transfer the Polish economy onto a free market footing, which, according to many people here, will lead to the exacerbation of the present difficulties and a decrease in the standard of living of the majority of Poles. In the opinion of L. Balcerowicz, deputy head of government and Polish finance minister, decisive economic changes which will begin after 1 January 1990 will include a reduction in state expenditure, the creation of a private banking system, and the sale of state enterprises to private owners.

Before, "Solidarity" made attacks on the mass media, accusing them of "protecting the regime." And what is the state of affairs today, when for example, a "Solidarity" supporter has been put in charge of the Radio and Television Affairs Committee? TRYBUNA LUDU recently wrote the following about work in television: "A wave of semi-official reporting has descended on television viewers... Practically every broadcast of the 'Dziennik' television news program (the equivalent of our 'Vremya') begins with the words: The prime minister has received...."

Even the former trade union colleagues of the current "Solidarity" leaders are expressing dissatisfaction with their activities. " 'Solidarity' is now operating in exactly the same way that things happened 45 years ago, when 'tame' secretaries and chiefs were put in place," M. Jurczyk writes in the columns of the weekly SOLIDARNOSC SZCZECINSKA. Lech Walesa's 'Nomenklatura' has appeared." It is removing from the structure of the union the people whom the "Solidarity" leaders and their entourage consider objectionable for one reason or another.

Advent of 'Political Pluralism' in Hungary Noted

PM1411135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "Hungary: New Law"]

[Text] Budapest, 13 Nov—A Law on the Multiparty System has been promulgated. It brings into effect the juridical and legal provisions on the formation and activities of parties as adopted by parliament. Political pluralism has been legalized.

Societies which wish to become parties, revived old or "historical parties" as they are also known, and newly emerging parties will have to declare their intentions and their numerical strength. This will be followed by registration in court. The Constitutional Court will be the arbiter and controlling organ of their activity.

An amount of 100 million forints has been provisionally appropriated from the budget as "startup" funds. All registered parties will receive 1 million forints each. Furthermore, "groups of like-minded people" are divided into large, medium, or small according to their declared numerical strength. According to this classification, they will be able to receive a further amount of 15, 10, and 4 million forints respectively as "setup" funds. In the future, one-fourth of all state budget amounts approved by parliament for party activities will be distributed among them in proportion to their representation in parliament, and three-fourths of these funds

will be distributed according to election results. But the parties will not be entitled to receive aid from state organs, state enterprises, or foreign states.

It can be said that about 20 parties are, to all intents and purposes, already in existence in the country. Several of them are large.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Speaks on GDR Changes

LD1911195289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1458 GMT 19 Nov 89

[From "International Panorama Program," presented by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; interview with FRG Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher by Vladimir Kondratyev from FRG studio—date not given—recorded; Genscher speaks in German with superimposed Kondratyev translation in Russian]

[Text] [Kondratyev] This is how it always happens: What seemed to be sensational, unthinkable, and fantastic just a few days ago, is today perceived as everyday routine, is starting to pall, and I can full well understand my fellow FRG television journalists who are literally doing their utmost to maintain the spirit of novelty and out-of-the-ordinariness in relations between the FRG, West Berlin, and the GDR.

Indeed, one would not envy them. For the entire week last week, day and night—and it is already getting frosty cold—they were trying to catch yet one more historic and symbolic moment at the Brandenburg Gate. It was rumored that the GDR authorities were to make an ordinary check-point crossing for their citizens into the Western part of the city here. Now there is virtually no space in the FRG media for other topics. One wonders why there is such a hullabaloo about it, because to judge by all events, the process of reform in the GDR is being established in the long term. There will be quite sufficient occasion in the future to analyze the situation, to think through what is happening and how people are to go on living in future. But no! With the passion for detail characteristic of the Germans, they must right away go into all the details of the fundamentally new dialogue and give answers to the questions which are inevitably arising in people's minds.

The STERN magazine outdid them all in this respect. While its rivals are gathering bits and pieces of opinions by experts on the German problem, the magazine announced the upcoming issue of a special supplement entitled "STERN—The Year 2000." This will contain the scenario of the future awaiting the Germans. One can gather what it is about, incidentally, from the small extract from this scenario which has already been published.

So, imagine the turn of the century, 50 years after the schism of Germany. Chancellor Oscar Lafontaine, a Social Democrat, drives through the Brandenburg Gate to meet Hans Modrow, a GDR leader, in order to discuss a German confederation, one of the forms of closer interstate communication. The negotiations on the last phase of conferation end with a proposal by Bonn which in effect means creating one state with one currency, one army, with one passport for citizens. Modrow is indignant: The question raised is virtually that of the elimination of socialism. The GDR Government is intent on putting the question of the existence of the GDR under the umbrella of a confederation to a nationwide plebiscite. With this, the excerpt ends, and we never do find out how the plebiscite ends and what the results are. We probably have to wait for the next issue of STERN.

The Christian Social Union [CSU] conservatives, however, seem to have no doubt about what the citizens of the GDR would vote for in this event: They would naturally vote for reunification. They have great faith in the attractiveness of the Western social system. The FRG Government, however, is a heterogeneous mechanism: Alongside the hotheads, there are politicians here who have earned general respect for their ability to look deeply into problems and to weigh the pros and cons before coming to any decision.

Hans Dietrich Genscher, the longest-serving minister of foreign affairs in the world, knows the intra-German problems better than many of his government colleagues. Up to the beginning of the 1950s he lived in the GDR, and studied at Halle and Leipzig universities.

Mr Minister, the whole world is literally holding its breath at the moment, watching the swift changes on the border between the two German states, and in the GDR itself. What are your feelings on this turnabout in GDR policy, how do you view the current situation?

[Genscher] We in the FRG approve of this development. We feel a sense of joy that the people of the GDR have raised their voice in favor of greater freedom and greater democracy. It is not only the citizens of the GDR who gain from such a development: The whole of Europe stands to gain, if freedom and democracy are reinforced.

It is becoming increasingly noticeable that the policy we began to implement in the longterm on the basis of the all-European process is yielding fruit. Furthermore, it is evident that the example set by Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev, of a policy of openness within his country and beyond its bounds, is finding more and more followers.

[Kondratyev] The GDR opening up its borders sparked off renewed and reinvigorated discussion in the West, including in the FRG, on a possible German reunification. There are various prognoses on this. For instance, Kissinger, former advisor to the U.S. President, asserts that a sort of reunification will take place in 5 years time. What is your opinion on this, Mr Minister?

[Genscher] I think we must heed closely how the GDR citizens themselves shape up the agenda. They have put right at the top of this list of urgent problems the

aspiration to free elections, respect for human rights, and democratization of life in the GDR. Their desires must be respected. All this shows how they set their priorities. It is understandable that in a Europe which is becoming more interdependent both German states will get closer together. For it would be completely unnatural for them to get further apart while other countries are closing ranks. One can therefore only welcome GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow's statement that a community of states guided by mutual responsibility must give rise to a community on a treaty basis, with increasingly close ties and more fruitful cooperation.

[Kondratyev] There are diverging views on this in the FRG. What sort of Europe is meant when it is said that the answer to the German question can be only a European one? For there are quite a few politicians who imply a Europe stretching from Portugal to Poland.

[Genscher] We do not want to exclude the Soviet Union from this Europe! Our idea of a European peace system includes territory from the Atlantic to the Urals. This was pointed out in Herr [name indistinct] reports. The concept of the common European home does not exclude the Soviet Union, either. The Soviet Union is a country belonging to Europe. It is the European East that starts at Poland's Eastern Border, not Western Asia.

[Kondratyev] To what degree, in your view, can the current process, the current changes we are now observing, affect the general East-West dialogue, first and foremost in respect of the military-political sphere?

[Genscher] The process of democratization stimulates the process of establishing confidence in Europe. We must now concentrate all our efforts on continuing the disarmament negotiations. But in Vienna, where conventional arms are on the agenda, and in Geneva, where a dialogue on eliminating chemical weapons is under way, disarmament must not lag behind this dramatically incandescent political development. Disarmament must at least go in step with it, so that the weapons stockpiles of both sides are no hindrance to Europe growing closer together and to closer cooperation. We need cooperational structures of security which will give people more trust in one another and more stability in Europe.

[Kondratyev] One can already read in the local press that following the latest events the plans for modernization of U.S. missiles can already be buried.

[Genscher] These are all issues which can be finally resolved much later on. But it is quite evident that the current events facilitate greater confidence and strengthen the opportunities for disarmament, pushing other problems into the background.

[Kondratyev] The second weekend after the opening of the borders at the junction of two sociopolitical systems, Germans are meeting one another. Soon, Soviet people will also be able to travel here more freely. The way to a common European home is getting shorter.

SPD's Rau To Meet Gorbachev in Moscow

LD2011134789 Hamburg DPA in German 1328 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Duesseldorf (DPA)—Johannes Rau (SPD) [Social Democratic Party of Germany], premier of North Rhine-Westphalia, will be the first leading SPD politician to meet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev after the opening of the GDR borders during a 3-day visit to Moscow. The focal point of the talks on 24 November from intra-German relations, are also to be improvements in economic cooperation.

The reason for Rau's visit, which begins on 22 November, is the opening of the North Rhine-Westphalian information days in Moscow, an economic exhibition. [passage omitted]

Portugalov on Intra-German Relations

AU1711152789 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 17 Nov 89 p 2

["Abridged version" of interview with Nikolay Portugalov, "Germany policy adviser at the CPSU Central Committee," by NOVOSTI correspondent Vladimir Markov: "Two Systems, One Nation"; date and place not given]

[Text] Markov: The changes in the GDR over the past 3 weeks are increasing in speed and radicalness—I mean, first and foremost, the freedom of movement for GDR citizens—to such an extent that the world public, but also politicians and experts, are completely surprised. What was the decisive factor for this change, in your view?

Portugalov: The breezes of perestroyka have reached the GDR. In many respects this was decisive for the latest development in our fraternal socialist country. This is by no means a crisis of socialism. Until the opposite is proved I adhere to the view that the majority of the GDR population are not willing to put humane socialism, reform socialism, if you like, up for disposition. However, it is indeed a crisis of the administrative command system in its GDR incarnation.

Markov: Mikhail Gorbachev recently said that the matters, which concern the GDR, are decided not in Moscow but in Berlin. However, what influence do you think Soviet perestroyka has on the formation of opinion and the current events in the GDR?

Portugalov: The latest development in the GDR would be unthinkable without Soviet perestroyka, without the enormous reforms in the Soviet Union. In any case, not in the way, in this beneficial way, it has taken place.

As regards the formation of opinion and decisionmaking, of course, we still consider the GDR as our main ally, as a fraternal socialist country. However, this does not mean that we will interfere in the events.

Markov: In view of the new conditions at the border between the two German states, how do you see the present and, in particular, the future of these states as regards the national interests of the Germans and all-European concern?

Portugalov: One thing is clear: There are not two German nations. There is one German nation. However, in particular the German nation has enormous historical experience with the national existence in several states. And I would not know, why (...) one could not simply say that the existence of a sovereign GDR is not up for disposition, precisely because of the historical experience.

Let us not deceive ourselves: Reunification, as this is imagined in certain circles of the FRG, is not liked by any of the neighbors of the two German states in the East or in the West. This is incompatible with the geopolitical and geostrategic requirements of stability. Therefore, I think that, in the foreseeable future and also in the long run, the two German states will continue to exist as sovereign and equal states, not against each other but with each other—however, under the precondition that both are given the right to a special relationship as two states which belong to different systems but which are both states of the German nation.

Markov: How important are security policy aspects in this connection?

Portugalov: This is also directly linked with the right to a special German security, which mainly involves the fate of the Germans in Europe. Is it not true that, in the military and political confrontation which has unfortunately not yet been overcome, the Germans are the only people in Europe, that is, the peoples in the two states which are one German nation, who are uniquely condemned in Europe to shoot at each other if worse comes to worst—in the assumed case of a conflict. To me the optimum solution seems to be to bring the two sovereign German states, which have a special relationship with each other, further into an all-European order; (...) in this connection, the integration of the two German states into a Europe consisting only of the EC, which would be powerful but still only a part of Europe, would not be sufficient, in my view.

Markov: It is only natural that the profound changes in the GDR give rise not only to joy but also to a certain feeling of concern. How do you think such concerns could be taken into account in the interest of all people involved?

Portugalov: I think that the—as yet theoretical—concern about the all too quick process of rapprochement between the two German states, which might lead to a new unification [Neuvereinigung]—this is a fashionable word, but there is something to it—is far too premature.

In this case one can expect a speedy and beneficial development for the Germans but also for all of Europe. I am very optimistic that it could go as far as potential federative structures in areas such as the economy, ecology, culture, and many other things. I think that this is possible.

Gorbachev: German 'Reunification Not on Agenda'

AU1711115689 Hamburg DPA in German 1122 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow—Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev has warned against "patronizing and know-it-all attitudes" in the West concerning the reform process in the USSR. This was stated by [FRG] Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth in Moscow on Friday [17 November] following her 90-minute talk with the Kremlin leader. The meeting was also attended by French National Assembly President Laurent Fabius. Gorbachev stressed once more that "reunification is not on the agenda," Mrs Suessmuth pointed out. However, he stated that relations between the two German states will of course undergo changes as a result of the changes in the GDR.

"Everybody who wants us to fail expresses this by saying that socialism has failed and by suggesting that we should take over other models," Mrs Suessmuth quoted Gorbachev as saying. Cooperation is only possible on the basis of mutual respect for the systems. Reforms need time, he stated. Those who "press too hard from outside endanger the entire reform process in Eastern Europe," Gorbachev stressed.

Issues concerning parliamentary cooperation were discussed in a meeting between Mrs Suessmuth and Gorbachev's deputy in the highest state office, Anatoliy Lukyanov. During the talk the Soviet side hinted that it might be ready to find a solution to the question concerning Berlin deputies from the FRG Bundestag during visits to the USSR.

FRG's Suessmuth, France's Fabius Visit

Received by Gorbachev

LD1711183189 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev met President of the West German Federal Assembly Rita Suessmuth and President of the French National Assembly Laurent Fabius, in the Kremlin today.

West Germany and France participated in the building of Europe at its first stage linked with West European integration and now wish to play an active role at the stage of the deepening of European processes, which has become possible due to the new Soviet foreign policy, Fabius explained.

Fundamental questions of development in the East and West of Europe, including perestroyka in the USSR, and problems related to the common future of European peoples were discussed during the conversation.

The sides expressed satisfaction over the fact that the Helsinki process, gathering momentum, is becoming more profound and thus created the foundation for the historic solution of complicated problems which Europe inherited from the past.

It was also said that answers to these questions can be sought, proceeding from principles of unconditional respect for the rights of every nationality, including its right to choose its own road of development, without any outside pressure or attempts to influence internal processes.

Gorbachev noted that in the recent past, in post-war years, relations in Europe were developing abnormally and resembled religious wars.

Each of the sides was prepared to destroy the other solely because it had different views.

Luckily, this period has ended now that the awareness of the unity of civilisation and the primacy of common human interests is being gradually established.

The East and West are now living through profound changes precisely due to the awareness of the needs of the times.

They have started moving towards each other, while each of the sides retains its identity.

If these new tendencies in policy are adequately reflected and supported, the world can become more tranquil and it will be possible to establish new relations among peoples, suiting their common interests.

It is certainly not easy to pass on to such relations. Politicians in the East and the West were molded by their times and all are burdened by old stereotypes. To get rid of them is difficult but necessary.

"We feel this also in our country, in the course of perestroyka, which is, first and foremost, the process of profound changes in the way people think," Gorbachev said.

The pace of changes in the East is clearly ahead of the changes in the West. The reason for this is that some in the West still hope in vain that processes in socialist countries will bring them to Western values. But fixed ideas in inter-state relations should not interfere with realistic policies.

Gorbachev supported the idea expressed by Fabius, that the process of democratisation should be combined with the preservation of stability, otherwise anarchy will set in.

The Soviet president emphasised that although the changes are positive, they inevitably bring much sediment to the surface.

To promote everything positive and to get rid of the sediment will mean ensuring stability, both within separate countries and in world affairs.

On behalf of the West German Government, Suessmuth said that Bonn circles believe there is no alternative to European cooperation and European peaceful order. It is important that all countries, including the German Democratic Republic and West Germany, meet each other half-way, and learn from each other, without trying to give orders.

The European Community on the whole is interested in the success of perestroyka in the USSR and in other countries of Eastern Europe, said the president of the West German Federal Assembly.

Fabius expressed the French leaders' striving to promote the positive development of transformations in the Soviet Union.

The participants expressed readiness for the deepening and widening of equal and mutually advantageous cooperation between West Germany and France, on the one hand, and the USSR, on the other.

In conclusion Gorbachev expressed satisfaction with the meeting of representatives of the three countries on whose activity and determination the prospects of the European process largely depend.

Also taking part in the meeting were West German Ambassador to the USSR Klaus Blech and French Ambassador to the USSR Jean-Marie Merillon. Taking part in the meeting from the Soviet side were Yevgeniy Primakov, Rafik Nishanov and Vadim Zagladin.

Suessmuth Meets Ethnic Germans

AU1711080889 Hamburg DPA in German 0721 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth asked ethnic German emigrants from the Soviet Union for patience in solving their initial problems in the FRG. Mrs Suessmuth continued her 2-day visit to Moscow together with Laurent Fabius, president of the French National Assembly, with a meeting with a group of about 60 Soviet Germans on Friday morning [17 November]. "I welcome you to our country, but there are, above all, problems with housing; we ask you for patience," she told the emigrants.

Today, Friday, Mrs Suessmuth and Fabius will meet for talks with Soviet state and party chief Mikhail Gorbachev and his deputy Anatoliy Lukyanov. Furthermore, a meeting betwen 22 German and 22 French young people and a group of Soviet young people is planned.

At a dinner in the Kremlin the previous evening, the Bundestag president expressed her support for Europe. "We know that the German question can be solved only within the framework of a European solution," she said. "We want this Europe." Fabius spoke in favor of "a Europe without walls, a world without walls. Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Union Council, who gave the dinner together with Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the nationality Council, noted that it

is "extremely important that stability in Europe is not disturbed." "This stability is our joint achievement," he said.

Suessmuth Views Ties, EC

AU1711105589 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 17 Nov 89 p 1

[Manfred Rowold report: "Suessmuth: Without Strength, Aid to the East Is Impossible"]

[Text] Moscow—Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth, who arrived with French National Assembly President Laurent Fabius for a 2-day joint visit to Moscow yesterday, hopes to receive "a positive answer to the developments in the GDR."

In an interview with DIE WELT she said that she wants to make it clear "that German-Soviet relations do not constitute some solo actions, a decoupling of the FRG from the idea of European unification." It is "a common European task to establish cooperation with the Soviet Union and to bring about the restructuring of Europe and thus to overcome the division of Europe." Bonn is thinking of more wide-ranging unity than just German unity.

"The FRG—and the chancellor recently said this on various occasions—sees the solution of the German question in the European context," the Bundestag president continued. "If the reform processes in the countries of central, southeast, and eastern Europe are successful together, there will also be success in the GDR concerning the solution of the German question." Mrs Suessmuth called for strengthening the role of the EC: "Without the strength, which we have as the Western community of values and security, without the strength of the economic community, the political pressure could not be exerted and, by the way, aid to these countries would also be impossible."

"At the moment," she "cannot yet imagine" a joint visit with the president of the GDR People's Chamber. It is "politically useful and necessary to wait for the time being."

According to Mrs Suessmuth, the Soviet parliament is "one of the most exciting parliaments of the present." Democracy is decided "in parliament and not in the government." She hopes for "a clear yes to the reform processes. This would be a positive result for us, because the statements of the past days do have an irritating tone."

Moscow TV Views FRG Reaction to GDR Events

LD1411223989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 14 November, in the "Vremya" newscast, carries a 12-minute videoreport by correspondent V. Kondratyev from Bonn on the influx of people from the GDR, and discusses the difficulties caused by the lack of convertible currency for these people who have received a present of DM100 from the FRG Government and have been able to change M15, one for one, at the GDR bank. "The situation has to be corrected, but all the talk about rendering economic support to the GDR on the part of the FRG is tied up with replacing the planned system of running the economy with a market system. Increasingly frequently, one hears theses here about the threat of the sale of the GDR's economic potential owing to the imbalance in the monetary course to the rich old uncle of the West. The political sale is seen as much more serious, which the right-wing conservative circles in the FRG understand as a peaceful anschluss of the state structure of the GDR, if the ruling regime there does not survive free elections.

"Everything, the experts on the Bonn political scene think, looks as if Bonn has not completely realized the scale of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany's new policy and does not have the respective conceptions of its own. Events have taken the FRG Government by surprise. FRG president Von Weizsaecker, with his characteristic circumspection, insistently calls for restraint to be manifested at the present time, not to make attempts to impose upon the residents of the GDR the ideals and ideas of the FRG. There are individual politicians in the ranks of the Christian Democrats who do not believe in the far-fetched postulate that most of the Germans in the East are only waiting for unification.

"True, Helmut Kohl did express the view that there will be a European solution in response to the German question. But what exactly is meant by these remarks is only known to the chancellor himself. Incidentally, the European Community is already talking about making the GDR one of its members.

"The events in the GDR and around it cannot be regarded in isolation from the processes taking place today in other socialist countries, including our own. The actual elimination of the symbols of the cold war and of the division of Europe into two confrontational blocs, the Berlin Wall, the opening of original doors to the future of the common European home, should not remain the sonorous slogans to which the FRG is continually resorting at the present time."

The video report ends with footage of GDR cars lining up, pictures of Von Weizsaecker and Kohl, and scenes of the Berlin Wall being knocked down.

Woerner Cited on East Europe Changes

PM1411133589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under "From Abroad" rubric: "NATO Stance"]

[Text] Brussels, 10 Nov—NATO Secretary General M. Woerner has advocated "unilateral aid" to the countries of East Europe to ensure that the processes there develop "under optimum conditions." "The world is changing

rapidly and it is quite clear that the North Atlantic alliance cannot continue to act as it has hitherto," he said in Brussels.

M. Woerner stressed that both East and West are interested in the success of the reforms taking place in socialist countries. According to him, NATO will support the reformist forces in their undertakings as long as they progress toward greater glasnost, greater freedom and democracy, economic liberalism, and provision of the right to self-determination. If the change in the systems in the East European countries leads to their collapse, this may have catastrophic consequences. It is in our common interests to avoid the explosive development of events.

Woerner admitted that "there is no doubt" that the Soviet Union is considerably reducing its armed forces and that "impressive progress" has been made in the arms control sphere.

News Coverage of Gorbachev Visit to Italy Cited

PM2011110989 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Nov 89 p 5

[Interview with Vyacheslav Agadzhanov, general director of MODUS VIVENDI NEWS AGENCY, by correspondent An. Balebanov under rubric "We Report Details": "Getting To Know Each Other Better"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] On the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy the Italian news agency MODUS VIVENDI has prepared a special edition devoted to the Soviet leader and his biography. A SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent asked Vyacheslav Agadzhanov, general director of the agency, to comment on this fact.

[Agadzhanov] I shall say immediately that attempts to publish a biography of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary before the start of his visit to a particular country have not been made before. But, of course, it is not a matter of seeking a sensation. It is simply that we know that Italians have enormous sympathy for the Soviet leader and I do not doubt that an exceptionally warm reception will be given him in Italy.

The Soviet leader's biography has been published in the form of a big journal with a fine colored dust cover. The publication is for an Italian readership.

Italians are attentively following the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and they understand how complicated it is to implement the deep reforms which have been planned. But at the same time, they believe that M.S. Gorbachev and his supporters have enough endurance and vigor to cope with the difficulties.

[Balebanov] I think SELSKAYA ZHIZN readers would be interested to know what the Italian MODUS VIVENDI NEWS AGENCY is.

[Agadzhanov] It was founded about 2 years ago and has branches in the Soviet Union, Italy, and the FRG. Its aim is to eliminate the shortage of information about each other which still exists in relations between the USSR and Italy. After all, we can and must get to know and understand each other better.

[Balebanov] What are your immediate plans?

[Agadzhanov] Immediately after the end of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy we will start covering the summit meeting between the Soviet leader and the U.S. president on warships near Malta. Incidentally, we are prepared to supply interested Soviet publications with information about the course and results of this historic meeting. You can contact us in Moscow on telephone number 229-05-02 or write to the following address: Number 5, Granovskiy Street, Moscow 103009.

PCI Debates 'Cardinal Reform' of Party

PM1711103989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent N. Miroshnik report: "Italy: Threshold of Change"]

[Text] Rome, 15 Nov—At the Italian Communist Party [PCI] headquarters on Botteghe Oscure in Rome a session of the PCI leadership began yesterday which both left-wing forces and the country's political circles in general regard as historic. The matter at issue is a cardinal reform of the party which even embraces the change of its emblem and its name, from which the word "communist" will be omitted.

A. Occhetto, secretary general of the PCI, addressed the leadership's first session, in which 53 members took part. He devoted a significant part of his report to a critical analysis of the situation in the communist movement in Europe and of the changes taking place in the socialist countries.

Occhetto advocated the "intensification of relations" with the Socialist International, without which it would be difficult to "work effectively at the international level."

On the urgent tasks facing the party, the speaker talked among other things about the possibility of moving to a path leading "to a constituent congress in the most real sense, a process ending in something new with a new name."

There is a need, he stressed, to create a "democratic, progressive, socialist, and people's party" whose ideological core would be "socialist democracy, socialism, and freedom." "In essence," Occhetto stated, "we want to create a new political formation and to bring together and express the vast potential of left-wing forces. Our changes are subordinated to that goal: The name will be the consequence of those changes and the result."

The ideas he expressed produced an immediate and great response. Thousands of people—both those who fully share the idea of the need for a cardinal reform of the PCI and those who want to retain the party's traditions, including its name—telephoned the Central Committee and the editorial office of the party paper L'UNITA yesterday.

There was an extensive discussion at the leadership session, too, and for the first time the entire proceedings were publicized. Almost all of the nearly two dozen speakers actively supported the report's main provisions. The discussion will continue today. Later, as Occhetto announced at a press conference during a recess between leadership meetings, the question will be submitted to the next Central Committee plenum, after which it is planned to begin a broad discussion within the party which should show the urgency of convening an extraordinary and, in its way, constituent congress.

Flight Inaugurates Baku-Istanbul Air Route

PM1511112189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Baku-Istanbul Flight"]

[Excerpt] Baku—Soviet pilots have built a new air bridge from the banks of the Caspian to the Marmara Sea. A Tu-154 airliner on a Baku-Istanbul charter flight flew this route for the first time 12 November. [passage omitted]

Economic Reform Conference

Aganbegyan on Results of 3-Day Conference

LD1711191289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Today in Moscow a 3-day all-union scientific and practical conference on the problems of radical economic reform has ended. Besides two plenary meetings, an in-depth discussion of economic problems took place in eight separate sections and at several sittings of roundtables. More than 250 scientists, economists, practical workers, local Soviet and party workers, and economic managers spoke in all those proceedings. The conference did not adopt any declarations, but decided to thoroughly study the speeches of all the speakers, and the numerous written contributions of the participants of the conference as well, and to transfer the generalized material into the relevant commissions of the CPSU Central Committee and the government for practical work. Our correspondent Igor Zorin has interviewed Academician Aganbegyan, rector of the Academy of the National Economy attached to the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Begin recording] [Zorin] From the point of view of the practical use for our national economy, what conclusions can be made about the 3-day conference that has ended in Moscow?

[Aganbegyan] Such conferences have a more fundamental meaning. They form public opinion, they form ideology that leads not to some single solution, but to a cascade of solutions to their general tendency. We are confronting the necessity to develop and deepen economic reform, and the direction in which we are to move further in restructuring our economic mechanism, and, I think in an ideological sense our conference has consolidated the material the government has drawn up and made public in the report of Abalkin, deputy chiarman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Zorin] I recall that with the help of central television you were almost the first person who introduced the idea of perestroyka to the masses from the screen. Did you think then that perestroyka would be so difficult in coming to us, because it was difficult to conjecture that such crude and in some sense absurd economic mistakes would be made—mistakes made by us and socialist countries as well—that plunged the country into a financial crisis and into a crisis of the consumer market. They are erroneous budget planning, sharp excess of expenditures over revenues, and incorrect regulation of the dynamics of the wage fund during the transfer from administrative to economic methods.

[Zorin] The mistakes. Is this the result of the victory of the administrative and command apparatus over science, which was offering something different?

[Aganbegyan] To a certain extent, yes, but there is more at issue. They were not mistakes of malicious intention; to a considerable degree, they were mistakes of incompetence, like, shall we say, the mistake of a sharp increase in the price of vodka, which has cost us, in my estimate, about R15 to 20 billion, since because of it the sales turnover has decreased without any decline in drunkenness, and a great amount of hard currency had to be brought in to purchase the sugar needed to distill home vodka, additional sugar.

[Zorin] How do you evaluate the state of perestroyka?

[Aganbegyan] I evaluate the state of perestroyka in the economy as absolutely unsatisfactory, but we have no alternative. I do not entertain the thought that we will not find ways out of the present critical conditions. [end recording]

Abalkin Comments on Protest, Conference

LD1911235489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Nov 89

[From "Seven Days" newscast]

[Text] [Tikhomirov] Such pickets stood outside the House of the Unions in Moscow last week, where the conference on economic reform was being held. Well, Leonid Ivanovich, in your previous interview, you yourself admitted that your image is declining among a certain part of the population. How do you regard this demonstration?

[Abalkin] Well, first of all, I'd like to say that this was a scientific conference. There are various methods of bringing pressure to bear on science, imposing an opinion on a scientist, and controlling him. And we know what the cost of that was in our history. I think that the scientist must be protected both from the administration which can give him instructions and from the crowd. He should have an opportunity to voice his views, everything he thinks, and to submit his arguments. It is up to the decision making bodies either to take his views into account or to reject them. As regards the public feeling which we have just seen, it reflects certain feelings in society and determines a turn which I could describe as a turn to the right, toward the prevalence of conservative forces. It includes speculating on the current difficulties, attempting to confuse society, and proposing unrealistic recipes and measures. As regards such methods of pressure, one has to have the courage to go all the way to the end.

[Tikhomirov] You have said that it is the scientist's duty to present arguments. But now you are both a scientist and a decisionmaker.

[Abalkin] On behalf of our commission on Economic Reform, and with help from specialists, of course, we prepared proposals and submitted them, as the saying goes, about a month before the conference started. We published these materials and invited specialists from all over the country, representatives of academia, higher

educational and industrial science, production organizers, practical workers, and representatives of all the union republics to give their views. Their voices had to be heard. This was not a program made up of slogans, but a constructive development with the clear-cut definition of time limits, sequence, stages, directions, and measures, the evaluation of their advantages and disadvantages, and one would like to hear their appraisals. And each of those invited should be given a chance to voice his view. And different views were voiced.

[Tikhomirov] And sometimes even opposite ones.

[Abalkin] Yes, mutually excluding opinions were voiced sometimes. But it is clear today—and I think this is the general view of participants in the conference—that the Soviet economy has no tomorrow without reform.

[Tikhomirov] This is absolutely true because some days ago two directors—they are identical twins—were in this studio, and they said that they had no confidence in the future, they saw no prospect for today. Do you or the government have a clear-cut program? Can we say, taking stage by stage, what will happen next year, a year later, 2 or 3 years later, and how to advance?

[Abalkin] We have to submit such a program to the Congress of People's Deputies in less than a month and put forward our version of solving the problems that have accumulated. I would say even more. Time limits are short. This television program is being broadcast on Sunday, and on Monday the Supreme Soviet will examine another batch of governmental proposals, including additional measures for stabilizing the consumer market and strengthening price controls. If this package of measures, which we are going to submit, is accepted, we can say that in this case we guarantee such and such result. But what if it is not accepted?

[Tikhomirov] Yes, it is a complex thing to work with such a Supreme Soviet, not with that docile instrument which was just a voting machine, but with this one which sometimes turns into a battlefield, as the saying goes, while discussing problems and laws.

[Abalkin] Well, this, on the whole, makes work more complicated, though it maybe enhances its democratic character, range, and the possibility of taking account of some sort of really collective reason. Coming back to the conference, if one speaks about the main line and fundamental direction, it was backed, in general, and everybody understands that the version of moderately radical develpment chosen by the government seems to combine in the most realistic way both elements of radicalism and an accelerated movement and elements of well-considered steps and consistency.

[Tikhomirov] We have acquired experience, and as far as I can see, you still insist that the government should be given say 15 months to halt the process of inflation and then advance in accordance with the existing program.

[Abalkin] Thirteen.

[Tikhomirov] You have already 13 months?

[Abalkin] Yes, already 13. The countdown has started. Fifteen, 14, 13, 12 have been left before some kind of finishing line. It is awfully dangerous to waste time and to bury real steps in words.

[Tikhomirov] I think that many people in the country will back this thought. You are the head of the Committee on Economic Reform. The identical twins, two directors from Krasnoyarsk and Voronezh Oblasts, are in technical sciences; therefore, they have drawn up a table or graph—I do not know how this is called in the language of engineering—which is very curious. This is called a system of the methods which are used locally for putting the brake on perestroyka with the purpose of discrediting the decisions adopted by the higher echelons of power. I think that it may be high time for your committee to get down to also studying the mechanism of braking down there, at enterprises, where everything is decided. What do you think?

[Abalkin] with assistance from specialists and scientists on its own, the committee cannot do very much. We have a relatively small apparatus. We will not be able to cope on our own. People think that here in Moscow there are some generators of ideas and developers who can grasp everything. One should accumulate the entire experience and potential, make alternative versions collide and strike a spark from this collision, a spark that will illuminate the path.

[Tikhomirov] Well, you have a lot to do and I would like to hand you this contribution by Brothers Zhilin, directors, identical twins.

[Abalkin] Thank you, I think that every idea and sensible proposal and every advice is valuable today.

Reform Conference Panel Discusses Finance

PM1711160589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p2

[M. Berger report: "Ailing Money; Notes From Scientific and Practical Conference"]

[Text] As already reported, the All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on the Problems of Radical Economic Reform is being held in Moscow. November 14 was the day for section sittings. We will be reporting in detail on the work of some of them. Our first report comes from the section "Restructuring the Finance and Credit System."

We have recently had the opportunity to see for ourselves very clearly what is, generally speaking, a simple fact of life: Lack of confidence in money is far more dangerous both for the country's economy and for its social stability than lack of confidence in the government. The cabinet of ministers in the era of stagnation was not the most popular, but the consumer market—albeit highly limited—was relatively calm and society did not know the kind of social tension it does now. It is

not, of course, that the old economic model was more effective. On the contrary, many of today's difficulties have been caused by the worthlessness of the administrative edict economic structure. However, people did not avoid money like the plague and were not in a hurry to get rid of it at all costs.

This is partly explained by the fact that the population's income was considerably inferior to its present income and there was no talk of reforms, price reforms included. As far as enterprises were concerned, the money they earned was simply taken away from them and the question of backing this money up with goods seemed to disappear of its own accord. And a ruble that you do not have the opportunity to dispose of very freely—either because it does not go very far (personal budget) or because it is taken away (enterprise accounts)—appears to be above suspicion.

The present government, for all the nuances of attitude toward it and its individual members, as a whole arouses far more sympathy and trust than the one we had during the years of stagnation. However, the present consumer hysteria in our country (the term "panic buying" no longer fully describes the state of the consumer who is prepared to buy up anything in sight, even 30 kitchen stools, just so long as he can turn the ruble to some use), which is precisely the result of lack of confidence in our rapidly depreciating money, rising prices, and talk of possible monetary reform, has placed both the government and society as a whole in an extremely difficult situation.

How to get out of this situation and cure our ailing money (the word "finances" is recently hardly used at all without the word "recovery") is one of the central problems being discussed at the conference. The discussion which developed on this subject in the finance section can conditionally be divided into two blocks. The first block is the purely professional one: What kind of banking system we should have, what should be done with commercial banks, and whether the recent bank reform, which divided the State Bank into six specialized banks, has been successful or not (the latter has mostly been positively assessed by those who now head the new subdivisions, while the remaining speakers adhered to the opposite opinion). This discussion has mainly been led by bankers, practical workers, and theoreticians. The second block is the "general civic block": It is concentrating on personal money, the consumer market, and the taxation system. Here the floor is usually taken by academcs, lecturers at higher education establishments (VUZs), and even representatives of scientific cooperatives.

As far as the first block is concerned, on the whole you get the impression that the discussion has not satisfied either the Moscow bankers or their colleagues from the provinces, who at times have appeared simply not to understand each other. Some have confused a two-tier banking system (the first tier would be the State Bank, with all other banks as its clients: joint-stock, commercial, innovation banks, and so forth) with a two-tier system of management (there can be as many tiers as you like, as it is not their number that is the decisive factor). Others wonder why commerical banks have been "allowed," as they are now in competition with state banks and are taking their clients and monetary resources.

As a result of the "different languages" seen to be spoken by the professionals, it has been suggested that the country's bankers themselves go into conference and "clear up" key points of banking affairs.

The "general civic" discussion, although offering different, sometimes diametrically opposite points of view, has been heated, impassioned, and, to all appearances, based on an adequate understanding of the sides' positions. One of the main questions of the discussion has been this: What is to be done with the vast amount of money (not really so vast, but unmanageable for our weak, collapsing consumer market): Should it be withdrawn or redeemed? Addressing the sitting, USSR People's Deputy N. Shmelev said that, judging by the Ministry of Finance report, this department is still committed to the primitive philosophy which amounts to taking as much money as possible from enterprises and the population—as if this primitive pillaging is in the state's best interests.

In the opinion of N. Shmelev, who expressed bewilderment at what he called the "majestic" calm of the Ministry of Finance, which carries considerable responsibility for the collapse of the economy, injecting money into the budget with the aid of developing turnover tax is an economic anomaly (with the exception of taxing certain kinds of goods, such as vodka, tobacco, and so forth). Money also should not be taken with the aid of monetary reform (true, this idea has nothing to do with the Ministry of Finance). It will not produce the desired effect, because the black economy has invested its resources in reliable "businesses," in precious stones and metals, and, with the minimum of R10,000, with which even advocates of the most radical measures are agreed, too insignificant a sum of money is left that is liable to this kind of taxation. But the main point is that people who have accumulated money honestly will not forgive the insult of it being taken away, and this could undermine the social base of restructuring.

Many were agreed that the money should be redeemed with the aid of a broader supply of imports (including the sale of hard currency to the population by auction) and with the aid of selling apartments and attractive securities.

The government's proposal for a unified taxation system has prompted a lot of argument. In the opinion of a number of speakers, it cannot be called either just or unified in its principles. They suggested that a closer look be taken at the experience of Western economists

regarding taxation, particularly the theory of the American economist A. Laffer, who maintains that levying more than 35 percent tax from corporations takes away incentive and leads to stagnation. At the same time, speakers urged that the experience of developed market economies should not be mechanically applied to our own transitional economy.

Addressing the sitting, O. Mozhayskov, chief of a USSR State Bank Administration, formulated what, in his view, is the main flaw in the present monetary policy: The primacy of production over monetary supply and the ascribing of a secondary, "servicing" role to money, whereas money is in fact the brain and nerve of any market economy. Hence stems the main principle of correct policy in this sphere: Money, its quantity and quality, must determine the nature and volume of investment claims and, in many respects, economic behaviour as a whole.

Supreme Soviet Session

First Reading of Travel Bill Approved

PM2011114589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[A. Lyutiy, S. Pastukhov, and Yu. Ursov report: "Guarantees of Justice. PRAVDA Parliamentary Group Reports From Kremlin"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The draft Law on the Procedure for Soviet Citizens' Exit From and Entry Into the USSR was also submitted for the session's examination. This document, USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister A. Kovalev, who delivered a report on it, stressed, has above all been brought into being by Soviet society's internal needs, but at the same time brings our legislation into line with fundamental international legal documents.

The draft law as submitted meets high international standards. That is only one of its fundamental parameters. Virtually any Soviet citizen above the age of majority can now obtain a foreign passport for travel abroad over a 5-year period, with possible subsequent extension. Moreover, a personal application suffices for this—an invitation is no longer necessary. Those leaving to take up permanent residence need the consent of the state to which the applicant is going. This is linked with the tightening up of immigration norms in the receiving countries.

The state is not, of course, interested in stimulating a mass exodus of citizens and a "brain drain." But we cannot aspire to build a rule-of-law state without observing a fundamental human right—the right to free movement.

Deputies approved the basic provisions of the draft Law on Exit From and Entry Into the USSR at its first reading by 365 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

M.S. Gorbachev chaired the evening sitting. A.I. Lukyanov delivered a report on the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. After the debate the session ratified the date of the congress—12 December.

M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, and G.P. Razumovskiy took part in the discussion of the agenda of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The session continues today.

Shevardnadze Addresses Foreign Affairs Committee

LD1711220689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Sergey Medvedev report]

[Excerpts] Work continued in the committees and commissions at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet today.

[Medvedev] We are now at the extended sitting of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which is taking place with the participation of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. Let me recall that at the end of October the minister delivered in front of the Supreme Soviet a detailed account and report on our state's foreign policy activity and on the work of his ministry. Today's meeting is a continuation of that discussion and as far as I know—and this has been said here—the minister himself and the deputies are in favor of such reports becoming regular occasions. For too long the work of this department has taken place behind tightly closed doors and hence was beyond criticism. The minister today agreed with the deputies that this is not to the benefit of our foreign policy. So an account of what has taken place in this field since the last meeting in the Supreme Soviet and an analysis of events, and there have been a lot of these over the past 3 weeks.

Comrade Shevardnadze told the deputies about the results of the visit paid by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Finland, which was a major event in European politics. There was also a brief account of the way our relations with several countries in the West and Eastern Europe are developing. Talking about these socialist states the minister noted that the processes now taking place in them are natural and conditioned by history. They can be defined as the development of the democratization and renewal of socialism.

The deputies had a lot of questions for the minister and it is noteworthy that they were raised in the nature of problems. There was criticism, too. Deputy Burlatskiy, for example, noted that the USSR Foreign Ministry today concerns itself insufficiently with questions pertaining to the economy. [video shows Medvedev speaking to camera in the chamber; Shevardnadze seen addressing the sitting from the rostrum. Burlatskiy seen speaking from the floor]

[Begin recording] [Shevardnadze] I spoke in my address at the Supreme Soviet about perestroyka in the Foreign Ministry and so on. Indeed this process is not a simple one. Many comrades know that we never dealt with economic problems at all before—I mean the central apparatus of the ministry. Then we restructured ourselves in some way, subdivisions made their appearance in the territorial directorates and departments and so on and specialized subdivisions for the whole ministry: but that is not enough. We ourselves now feel that we are lagging behind. This is the weakest area of our activity and our diplomatic work. Now we have the appropriate idea and there will be a special deputy for the economy. So the observation is true and correct. We have to follow economic affairs constantly, since without the economy there is no politics. [video shows Shevardnadze seen speaking from the rostrum] [end recording]

[Medvedev] The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies will start its work on 12 December this year. There is not much time. For that reason, no doubt, the deputies who are working in the committees and commissions are currently actively discussing the standing orders of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet alongside the very important draft bills on ownership, on land, and on the taxation system. Here debates are taking place in the Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture and Upbringing. As you see they were fairly heated. [video shows Medvedev speaking to camera] [passage omitted]

[Correspondent V. Stepanyuk, identified from screen caption] These shots were taken at a sitting of the interim committee for the fight against crime. Under discussion here today was one of the most acute and topical problems—cooperation beween the law enforcement bodies in the campaign against organized crime. Opening the sitting, Comrade Lukyanov, the chairman of the committee, noted that the inclusion of this issue on the agenda of the Second Congress of People's Deputies is a reflection of the alarm and concern to which the continuing growth in manifestations of crime and the professional direction of these are giving rise in society. Many serious crimes are being committed by groups that are kept tightly secret and which are technically equipped. There are many cases where criminal elements merge with officials. Under these conditions cooperation between the internal affairs, procuracy, and state security bodies becomes of special importance. During the first half of the current year alone more than 500 organized criminal groups were exposed and rendered harmless. They had committed more than 2,000 crimes. Bakatin, minister of internal affairs, Sukharev, procurator-general, and Bobkov, first deputy chairman of the KGB, who spoke at the sitting talked about the need for a special campaign program against organized crime to be implementd within the shortest possible time scale. A number of documents aimed at strengthening law and order and intensifying the struggle against crime have been handed over for consideration by the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies. [video shows Lukyanov addressing the sitting; brief clips of Bakatin, Sukharev and Bobkov]

Notes Significance of U.S. Meeting

LD1711144489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Excerpt] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Aleksandr Ruvinskiy, commentator, is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] The work continued today in the commissions of the chambers and committees of the Supreme Soviet. One of the key ones was the extended session of the Committee for International Affairs. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, took part in it. He answered numerous questions of people's deputies, which arrived for him after his speech in the Supreme Soviet. The minister of foreign affairs also described the mutual relations between the Soviet Union and various states and he also dwelt in brief on the coming events of international life, saying in particular:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] The visit of Mulroney, Canadian premier, will take place in the very near future. We have good relations with this country. They are good news and they are, really, equal and mutually advantageous. I have no doubt that this visit will become a landmark in our relations. The visit of the head of the Soviet state to Italy will take place soon. It will be the first visit on this level in the history of our relations with this country. The first meeting with the head of the Roman Catholic church will also take place. The Soviet-Italian dialogue is significant for its outstanding, informal and—I would say—warm nature. It yields much from the viewpoint of understanding the potentialities of cooperation between East and West and the prospects for making headway in the pan-European process.

We agree with the view of Andreotti, Italian premier, that our dialogue will make it possible not only to deepen the conception of the common European home but that it will also promote the beginning of its practical implementation in a more intensive and dynamic way. Bilateral relations with Italy are also developing well. They will undoubtedly receive a new impetus from the coming summit talks. A sound package of major, very major and important agreements has been prepared for them. So that we have the right to expect weighty results from this visit.

And now on the Soviet-U.S. meeting. As was announced, it will be held without a fixed agenda. It is not planned to sign any agreements at it. There are simply none at the moment. But we are profoundly convinced that it will be of extraordinary significance for the relations between our two countries, and consequently for international relations as a whole. In principle, I would not rule out the probability that the two leaders will arrive at important

political statements and serious conceptual decisions. There is a foundation for this. It was laid in the course of the dialogue which has been developing in a productive manner since the historic Geneva meeting. Indeed, experience shows that discussions at that level lead to major conceptual breakthroughs in world politics.

Ultimately, it is not the formal pieces of paper adopted on the results of the talks that matter, of course; but rather the real impetus which these talks give for finding mutually acceptable solutions. I have no doubt that the forthcoming meeting will produce results in that sense. It will largely predetermine the scale of possible decisions on all elements on the Soviet-U.S. agenda, and will make it possible to define the timescale in which they will be reached. [end recording] [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Report of Address

PM1811001189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Dialogue in the Interests of Perestroyka"]

[Text] It is just over 3 weeks since the memorable statement delivered at the USSR Supreme Soviet's second session by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister. It was memorable because his report on the work by the department he heads restored the practice, existing way back under V.I. Lenin, whereby the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs submitted annual reports to the Congress of Soviets. A large number of questions were addressed to E.A. Shevardnadze on that day. But in view of the acute shortage of time, caused by the fact that deputies had to consider the draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution, these questions remained unanswered. The USSR people's deputies were able to fully satisfy their interest in the Foreign Ministry's work on implementing the basic guidelines of our country's foreign policy at a new meeting with the minister. It took place in the Kremlin 17 November, at an enlarged sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, with A.S. Dzasokhov in the chair.

E.A. Shevardnadze addressed the deputies.

Our last meeting, he said, was followed by several foreign policy actions on which I would like to brief the members of the International Affairs Committee.

There was M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Finland. It was, in many respects, an extraordinary and truly major event in European politics. The talks in Helsinki and the entire practice of Soviet-Finnish cooperation offer an answer to many questions which arise as the package of our ties with Europe is undergoing perestroyka.

Finland's leadership—and this reflects the mood in many European countries—perceives a direct link between our perestroyka and the consolidation of positive trends on the continent and in the world as a whole. The Soviet-Finnish declaration—"New Thinking in Action"—testifies that two states like the USSR and Finland, so different in terms of their sociopolitical systems, can act jointly for the establishment of new thinking in the practice of international politics.

The visit produced a series of practical and specific results. Finland backed our idea for a meeting between the present generation of leaders from European countries, the United States, and Canada. It is prepared to host the "Helsinki-2" meeting. We arrived at important accords on collaboration in the United Nations and cooperation in the work to ban chemical weapons. Generally speaking, this country once again proved itself a reliable partner in international affairs.

The same can be said of the Nordic region as a whole. The Murmansk Program which we put forward 2 years ago is alive and working. In the course of the visit, it was developed as applied to the Baltic region. We advocated nuclear-free status for the Baltic Sea's waters and its ecological revival. In addition to this, we proposed establishing contacts with the Nordic Council. We perceive this as an additional channel for collaboration with European countries and for consolidating the northern wing of all-European security.

About our bilateral cooperation with Finland. The visit gave it fresh political, humanitarian, and economic meaning.

The Finnish leadership highly appraised the fact that we have spoken well in public of Finnish neutrality and have done away with innuendos in this regard. Now both sides proceed from the premise that the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance with the USSR and Finnish neutrality are not at odds but reinforce each other.

We agreed that our countries' foreign policy departments will start monitoring the practical performance of accords and agreements reached during the visit. I think that the first stocktaking as regards the state of affairs in this sphere will take place by the middle of next year, prior to the Finnish president's visit to the USSR.

Briefly about our relations with Poland. The elections there resulted in a situation whereby a coalition government was formed, with the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] as a partner.

How do we perceive this event? Primarily as Poland's internal affair. The elections were legitimate, held in conformity with the election provisions. The government was formed. The people made their choice. This choice was recognized and is respected by the PZPR. We have no grounds at all not to respect the Polish people's will.

Poland is a key country in the system of European politics and security. It is our neighbor, and this renders our relations with it especially important. The main point, as far as we are concerned, is stability in Poland.

In this regard, the current situation there is better than it was. What are the prospects?

The Mazowiecki government enjoys support. In many respects, however, this support has been given in advance. The population has extended its trust to the government on credit. A certain political consolidation is taking place in the country. I would like to say with utmost certainty that we are interested in seeing the Mazowiecki government cope with the difficulties and the Polish economy begin to function again. Let me repeat, Poland's stability is a factor in our national security, and we must assist the stabilization. The new government has declared loyalty to alliance agreements and desires to develop ties with the Soviet Union in all spheres.

What is changing in our relations? The degree of responsibility, I would say. Primarily, it is necessary to tackle practical problems in our bilateral cooperation. For a long time now, the prevailing mechanism has been unsuitable for us and the Poles alike.

There is the very acute question of "blank spots" in our shared, and very complex, history. It is indeed complex and its roots go far back into the past. Both sides have committed actions which overshadow our relations to this day. Here we will have to go even as far back as World War I and the period of foreign military interventions. The questions of 1939, Katyn, and repressions of Poles at different periods are especially acute.

A Supreme Soviet commission is dealing with 1939. As I understand it, it will soon present its conclusions. A joint Soviet-Polish group of scientists is working on Katyn. It is necessary for it to speed up its study of materials and to establish whether there are grounds to revise the existing version of events.

The Polish and USSR foreign policy departments have undertaken to monitor this work. It is in both countries' interests to make an objective appraisal of the past and to thoroughly investigate everything.

It must be said that people in Poland recall not only the "blank spots" but also the fact that over 800,000 Soviet solders and officers gave their lives in the battles for Poland's liberation. They recall, just as we do, the thousands of Polish citizens who fought the fascist invaders on our land.

The new period in Soviet-Polish relations demands of us new approaches, bold solutions, skillful policy, and the manifestation of understanding and tact.

We and Poland have a vast array of coinciding national interests, an array conditioned by geostrategic factors and European realities. It is on this basis that our relations ought to be built.

Prime Minister Mazowiecki will soon be visitng us. This will be followed by a visit by Foreign Minister Skubiszewski. They are highly educated people who think along modern lines. They have no prejudices against the Soviet Union. We will continue to maintain the closest of contacts with Poland's Communists. Our friends' leadership supports our line of dialogue with the new authorities. They feel neither insulted nor jealous. In its own turn, the new Polish government is also calm about our ties with our friends, perceiving them as a perfectly normal phenomenon. It suffers from no allergy on this account.

In conclusion, I would like to say that people in Poland highly appraise the stand taken by the Soviet Union in connection with the changes there.

A few words about the sitting of the Warsaw Pact states' Foreign Ministers Committee. I must admit that we were highly sensitive during the preparations for this meeting. After all, we were to gather in a different Warsaw, and much else had changed besides.

I am not afraid to use the word "new frontier." That was really the point at which we found ourselves. It was unusual to hear people addressed as "Mister" where all had been "Comrades" until yesterday.

There is no question that the sitting was of fundamentai importance. Its main outcome was the conclusion that our alliance is founded in the community of member countries' national interests, and the affirmation by all ministers of commitment to the Warsaw Pact alliance obligations. Moreover, Hungary, Poland in particular, and other countries clearly advocated the alliance's strengthening through the creation of a permanent political organ. A consensus on the need to have such an organ is emerging within the alliance.

It can be said that our alliance is confidently undergoing a major test and is proving its viability. No differences at all emerged as regards the political aspects of the alliance's functions.

The Warsaw sitting was attended for the first time by the allied states' ministers of foreign economic ties. An exchange of opinions took place on questions of economic cooperation. A unanimous opinion emerged regarding the need for a fundamental, profound, and radical restructuring of CEMA's mechanism and activity. There was also a critical appraisal of the bilateral mechanisms of cooperation. Much has to be altered there as well, and matters have to be taken toward transition to payments at world prices and in convertible currency.

The sitting showed that the economy is perhaps our alliance's weak spot. Bold and innovative approaches and solutions are needed along this avenue.

E.A. Shevardnadze briefly described the situation in East European countries.

The processes occurring there, the minister said, are natural and historically conditioned. Democratization, the renewal of socialism, and the exercise of the peoples' right to free choice are under way. In Europe's conditions, this right has its own specific features associated

with World War II, its results, and the postwar political and territorial structure. The European realities are primarily the existence of two German states and two military-political alliances. They also include the borders established after the war and enshrined in a series of internal legal acts, including the Moscow Treaty, the FRG treaties with East European countries, the Four-Power Agreement on West Berlin, and the Helsinki Final Act.

These realities are the foundation of Europe's security and stability. Nobody has the right to try to alter these realities unilaterally. They are our common heritage, and they can be dealt with only jointly, only subject to common agreement. This point of view is shared by our Western partners. This was confirmed during the Moscow conversations with French Foreign Minister R. Dumas.

The past must never be repeated. Europe and the world paid a high price for past mistakes. The Soviet people have not forgotten and never will forget history's lessons. This determines and will continue to determine our attitude to the processes occurring in Europe.

It does not follow from this that we are opposed to all change, that we are striving to maintain all European realities in a frozen state. Nothing is permanent, and I mean primarily military alliances. European realities will certainly change. But these realities are in a state of delicate equilibrium, and any disruption of this equilibrium may result in the gravest of consequences for all European peoples and the world as a whole. It would indeed be incorrect to say that the overall situation in Europe is not changing. On the contrary, it is precisely in Europe that dynamic changes have been occurring in recent years. They are proceeding within the framework of the Helsinki process via a quest for all-European consensus.

The Vienna agreements set a standard for the way that changes must be implemented in Europe. The main task is to continue the line of reducing levels of military confrontation, keeping in mind the movement toward the dissolution of the military-political blocs. We must not try to impose our views and our philosophy on other people. We must not make economic cooperation conditional on ideological terms and demands. We must not interfere in what happens in other countries.

This line must be followed with particular strictness in German-German questions. I believe that, from whatever positions the development of the situation in the GDR is approached, the bold steps toward renewal by that country's leadership are to be welcomed. They accord with the interests of socialism, with all-European interests, with the interests of the GDR people, and with the interests of its Warsaw Pact allies. They follow the track of the development of the Helsinki process, the implementation of the Vienna agreements, and the realization of the all-European home idea.

We support the policy of renewal and democratization of socialism in the GDR and we wish our friends and allies success, the minister stressed.

You are aware that major changes have occurred in recent days in the Bulgarian People's Republic. Essentially the entire political leadership has been renewed in Bulgaria and, as you know, the new leaders have some very interesting ideas about the concept of perestroyka and the renewal of Bulgaria's socialist society. We actively support this course followed by the new Bulgarian leadership.

Anyone who tries to make changes for appearance's sake, bypassing the existing all-European institutions for reaching agreement, must assume the responsibility for undermining the Helsinki process and causing the collapse of hopes for building a "new Europe" and the all-European home.

We must all cherish what has been achieved by joint efforts in the sphere of security, human rights, and economic cooperation. Positive shifts—significant shifts—have become possible thanks to the harnessing of the all-European principle and the national interests of all European states. Divergence from this proven principle will throw Europe backward, and a return to the ideologized stereotypes of the past must not be permitted. That would take us very close to a new "cold war."

And such a danger does exist. There are voices being raised in the West, asserting that the current changes are the consequence of the position-of-strength policy, that things are moving in the direction of Western values, and that a strong West is the guarantee of its irreversibility.

I affirm the contrary, the speaker said. The positive changes have come with the new political thinking and the reinterpretation it has brought of the role of force in international affairs. It was precisely the sense of greater security which emerged as a result of the new political thinking, of the steps toward a real reduction of armaments, and of measures to strengthen confidence that allowed us and the other socialist countries to embark on the implementation of their political and economic reforms. And to consider democracy and freedom to be Western values means giving vent to immodesty and suffering from a "Western greatness" mania. Universal values cannot be reduced to "Western values." Why impoverish mankind so! Mankind's spiritual sphere is much broader and richer. The socialist segment and the non-Western sector are worthily represented in it. Those who are in a hurry—and such statements are being made—to bury socialism can only be advised not to repeat past mistakes. The processes occurring in the socialist countries confirm that socialism is alive, is improving, is acquiring a new image, and is giving mankind hope of resolving many global problems of the present day.

We can be proud that our new revolution is acting as the locomotive of positive changes in the world and having a

favorable influence on world politics, engendering a warming of the international climate. We can look to the future with confidence. I have no doubts, the minister pointed out—and I said so at the New York Foreign Policy Association—that the model social structure of the 3d millennium will be characterized by a synthesis of all the positive experience that mankind has accumulated. Today we are already seeing signs of universal consolidation in response to the threats—nuclear, economic, ecological—to our civilization. It is only on this path that we will all be able to survive. The sooner this is understood, the greater our chances of salvation.

At this moment in Paris, a summit meeting of the EEC countries is taking place, at which the latest events in East Europe are being examined. We consider positive the Community's wish to investigate the processes currently taking place and to elaborate its own attitude to them. In my view, E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out, that attitude should be determined by the fact that a stable, secure, democratic Europe accords with everyone's interests. The renewal processes in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries lead in that direction.

In the period following the holiday, the foreign minister of Sweden and the foreign minister of France were in Moscow. The USSR attached great importance to these visits. They fell within the framework of the all-European dialogue which has been actively pursued recently. The discussions showed that there is broad accord concerning further ways of advancing the Helsinki process.

In the European area, politics is oriented on two all-European measures—the convening of the "Helsinki-2" summit in 1992 and the holding in 1990 of the meeting of the leaders of the European states, the United States, and Canada to conclude an agreement on a significant reduction in the levels of military confrontation. The Soviet Union has a mutual understanding in this connection both with Sweden and with France.

Naturally, questions of bilateral cooperation were discussed. On our partners' part, we sense a wish to develop trade and economic ties and to seek new forms of mutually advantageous exchanges. Very interesting opportunities are opening up for cooperation in cadre training, for studying one another's experience, and for establishing contacts between republics, oblasts, and cities and in many other spheres. As a whole, we can characterize our relations with those two countries as very good and as having favorable prospects, the minister stressed.

An historic event occurred just recently—the last bastion of classic colonialism fell. Elections were held in Namibia, as a result of which the South West Africa People's Organization received a mandate to lead the country. We congratulate the people of Namibia on gaining independence and wish them success and prosperity. We congratulate the South-West Africa People's Organization on its election victory. The victory crowns the long struggle of Namibia's patriotic forces for their country's freedom and independence. Namibia's example can be seen as a real result of the new political thinking and an affirmation of the fact that the most complex questions can be resolved by political means.

The Namibian people have acquired freedom thanks to the collective actions of the world community, the firm position of the UN Security Council, the efforts of the UN secretary general, and the support of the frontline states and the OAU. The United Nations played a tremendous role in this, ensuring the fulfillment of the provisions covering the transitional period and the holding of free elections in Namibia.

We can be proud that our country made a substantial contribution —political and even material ($57 million) in terms of materiel for the UN forces in Namibia—to the just solution of the Namibia problem. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate with the first government of free, independent Namibia.

The speaker drew the committee members' attention to the situation in Lebanon. As you know, he observed, Soviet diplomacy has been making great efforts all these years to assist the establishment of peace in that country. We have invariably supported steps which brought hope of an end to military actions in Lebanon.

In the recent period the Lebanese patriotic forces have consolidated and drawn up a charter for national unity, while the parliament has elected a new president of the country. A real prospect for stabilization and peace in Lebanon has emerged. It has been possible to achieve this thanks to the mediation of the committee of three Arab League states, the constructive position of Syria, and the active diplomacy of many Arab and other countries.

It is very important now to consolidate what has been achieved. We appeal to all the Lebanese sides to show prudence and restraint and to act only by political means.

A brief word about future events. Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney will be visiting very soon. Relations with Canada are truly good, sound, equal, and mutually advantageous. I do not doubt that this visit will mark a new stage in our relations. The Soviet head of state will soon be visiting Italy—the first such visit in the history of our relations with that country. The first meeting with the head of the Roman Catholic Church will also be held.

Soviet-Italian dialogue is notable for its remarkable, informal, and I would say, the minister stressed, warm character. It is very fruitful from the viewpoint of understanding the potential for collaboration between East and West and the prospects for advancing the all-European process.

We agree with Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti's opinion that our dialogue will not only make it possible

to deepen the concept of the common European home but will also contribute to starting its practical implementation and making it more intensive and dynamic.

Bilateral relations with Italy are also shaping up. They will undoubtedly gain a new impetus from the forthcoming summit talks. A substantial package of major and important agreements has been prepared for them. So we have a right to expect weighty results from that visit.

About the Soviet-U.S. summit. As has been announced, it will be held without a fixed agenda. There are no plans to sign any agreements at the summit. There simply are none yet. But it will have exceptional significance—we are profoundly convinced of this—for relations between our two countries and consequently also for international relations as a whole.

In principle I would not want to rule out the likelihood that the two leaders will reach important political conclusions [konstatatsiya] and major conceptual points, the minister pointed out. There is a basis for this. It lies in the progress of the dialogue which has been developing productively since the historic Geneva summit. And indeed experience shows that discussions at that level lead to major conceptual breakthroughs in world politics.

In the final analysis, of course, it is not a matter of formal papers being adopted on the results of the talks but of the real boosts which these talks give to finding mutually acceptable solutions. I do not doubt that the forthcoming meeting will produce results in this sense. It will go a long way toward determining the scale of possible decisions on all elements of the Soviet-U.S. agenda and will enable the timetable to be fixed for achieving them, E.A. Shevardnadze stressed.

The USSR foreign minister answered numerous question from the deputies.

Supreme Soviet Groups Discuss Leasehold

LD1811181789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1032 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov—The TASS parliamentary correspondent reports:

Representatives of six committees and chamber commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed the draft principles of legislation in the USSR and union republics on leasehold, which took place at the end of the week.

Opening the debate, People's Deputy Pavel Bunich, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform, reported that the draft law that had been submitted has come into being as a result of painstaking work over numerous proposals put forward both by the government and by deputies.

The preliminary analysis by the deputies of the leasehold bill showed the high degree of readiness of the document. Therefore, the deputies shared the view that the drafted document is a realistic basis for a general constructive debate at next week's plenary session. At the same time, the representatives of the committees and commissions put forward a number of qualitative observations which, in their opinion, must be taken into account without fail.

A large place in the debates was taken up by the agricultural aspect of leasing. This is not surprising; because it is the people of the land who have become kind of pioneers of the assimilation of this form of economic relations which is new to our present economy. The proposal to divide the leasing of land as a subject of agricultural economic operation into a separate section in the draft law under examination was heard at the sitting.

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on Agrarian Questions and Food, Ervid Yanovich Grinovskis, professor from the Latvian Agricultural Academy and people's deputy, drew attention to points which should be borne in mind so as not to put the realization of this draft under threat in the countryside. These are primarily fair price formation for the production sold by lessees, the time limits of the beginning of the levy of the lease payments from peasants, and favorable rates of taxation. Having noted that leasing constitutes a great step forward in economic relations in the village, the scholar, at the same time, pointed to the fact that it is not yet fully eliminating the alienation of the worker from the land. Leasing, he stated, must become a transitional form to individual labor ownership, also inclusive of the land.

Supreme Soviet Resolution on Ownership Law

PM1711204189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution: 'On Draft Law on Ownership in USSR'"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To accept the proposal by the commission constituted by the USSR Supreme Soviet to prepare for publication a draft Law on Ownership in the USSR, that the draft law which it has produced be published in the press for nationwide discussion.

2. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order and the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions, with participation by other USSR Supreme Soviet committees and its chambers' commissions, to finalize the draft Law on Ownership in the USSR with due consideration for the proposals and comments made by USSR people's deputies or received in the course of the nationwide discussion, and to submit it for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

Moscow, The Kremlin, 14 November 1989.

Implications of Bill Analyzed

LD1811120689 Moscow TASS in English 1151 GMT 18 Nov 89

["Ownership Bill up for Nationwide Discussion—TASS Comment"]

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—By TASS news analyst Igor Yefimov:

Soviet newspapers today published a draft law on ownership in the Soviet Union, bringing it up for a nationwide discussion in accordance with the parliament's decision.

Exceptional importance is being attached to this bill: The nature of ownership in many respects predetermines the socio-political system of a country.

The first reading of the bill, understandably, was keenly debated in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The debate revealed a broad spectrum of opinions ranging from views expressed by some people who believe that the adoption of such a law questions the preservation of socialism in the Soviet Union and the arguments of those who advocate private ownership which they regard as a cure for all the current economic ills.

A working group tried to find a common language in this respect. Recently it submitted a specified version of the document to the parliament.

However, this version also gave rise to a heated debate. In the end, it was decided to extend the parliamentary debate by bringing the document up to a nationwide discussion and listening to what people would say.

The essence of a new law is primarily in the fact that a diversity of forms of ownership will replace the state ownership which now covers virtually everything in the Soviet Union. All the forms of ownership—and this must be specially emphasised—are recognised to be equal.

The personal property of citizens is the first form of ownership mentioned in the bill. This in itself is unusual to the Soviet Union where it has been viewed upon as being of no importance to the country, if not suspicious.

The bill envisages the citizens' rights to an apartment, a country house, shares, and other values. The bill specially stipulates that "the composition and cost of property shall not be limited", if, of course, it has been acquired in a legitimate way.

There will also appear new notions, such as the property of the work collective, an individual peasant farm, and a joint-stock company.

The property itself will change its aspect: All-union property will not disappear but its scope will dwindle sharply. Along with it, there will be the property of the union republics and autonomous entities, and communal property.

During the parliamentary debate, the delegates failed to reach consensus on such issue as who should own land and natural resources.

Keeping these as the property of the union raises objections from a number of republics, Baltic ones, in the first place.

But then, the transfer of this entire property to the union republics would virtually deprive the federation of an economic basis for normal functioning.

The bill determines that land and natural resources "belong to peoples that live on a given territory and to the Soviet people as a whole." However, one can say with confidence that this wording will find its opponents.

Considering the fundamental nature of the bill for the entire economic reform in the Soviet Union, some parliamentarians suggested that it be adopted at the second Congress of People's Deputies, to be held in the middle of next month.

However, a majority of the delegates are against haste. Too much depends on the future law for it to be adopted hurriedly, they argue.

Text of Draft Law on Ownership

PM1711180189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

["Draft USSR Law on Ownership in USSR"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text]

Section I. General Provisions

Article 1. Socialist Ownership in the USSR

1. The foundation of the USSR socioeconomic system is provided by socialist ownership, which takes diverse forms of public ownership and private ownership by Soviet citizens.

2. Socialist property is created through the joint or individual labor of Soviet citizens and ensures their prosperity, material and personal independence, and social protection. It is based on the individual's freedom to dispose of his abilities for productive and creative labor and to choose the forms and methods for circulating the results of this labor to satisfy personal and social needs. Socialist ownership is incompatible with

workers' alienation from the means of production and rules out the exploitation of man by man.

3. The state promotes the augmentation of socialist property and ensures equal conditions for the development of all its varieties and forms.

Article 2. USSR and Union Republic Legislation on Ownership

In conformity with the USSR Constitution, the present law lays down fundamental provisions on ownership which shall have effect throughout the USSR's territory.

Relations of ownership not covered by USSR legislation shall be regulated by union republic legislation which does not run contrary to this Law.

Article 3. The Right of Ownership

1. The right of ownership in the USSR is recognized and protected by the Law.

2. An owner, at his discretion, possesses, utilizes, and disposes of property belonging to him, exercises his right to manage this property, and is entitled to perform any actions with regard to this property which do not run contrary to the law.

An owner is entitled to utilize the property belonging to him in the pursuit of any economic or other activity which is not prohibited by the law.

An owner may transfer his entitlements to state organs or to enterprises, organizations, and institutions, citizens, and other persons.

An owner may be obligated to permit limited use of his property by other persons in the cases, on the conditions, and within the limits laid down by the Law.

3. Exercise of the right of ownership must not infringe the rights and legally protected interests of citizens, enterprises, organizations, institutions, and other persons.

Article 4. Objects of the Right of Ownership

1. Ownership may be exercised over land, subterranean resources, forests, water, the animal world, natural resources on the continental shelf, buildings, fittings, equipment, money, securities, and other property including enterprises and other property complexes which, taken as a whole, are of economic or social value.

The results of the economic utilization of property (output, crops, revenues) belongs to the owner of such property unless otherwise provided by law or contract.

2. Air space and other natural objects in their natural state not mentioned in paragraph 1 of this article are not objects of ownership and are utilized according to regulations laid down by USSR and union republic legislation.

3. Intellectual ownership includes all rights associated with intellectual activity in the production, scientific, literary, and artistic spheres.

Inventions, information material, patterns [poleznyye modeli], industrial models, trade marks, logos, firm names, and other objects are protected as objects of industrial ownership in conformity with USSR and union republic legislation.

Relations associated with the creation and utilization of objects of intellectual and industrial ownership are regulated by special USSR and union republic legislation.

Article 5. Forms of Ownership

1. Ownership by citizens includes property for consumption and production purposes. Citizens utilize their property either individually or jointly with other citizens united within labor, including peasants', partnerships [khozyaystvo] or other owners' collectives.

2. Collective ownership takes the form of ownership by labor collectives and ownership by working people's associations (collective enterprises), cooperatives, economic partnerships, joint stock associations, economic associations, public organizations, and other associations of citizens.

3. State ownership includes All-Union ownership, union republic ownership, ownership by autonomous republics and other autonomous formations, and ownership by administrative-territorial formations (municipal ownership).

Property transferred by the state to a state enterprise is subject to the full economic control of the enterprise in question.

Parcels of land may be assigned to citizens for life-long, inheritable possession.

4. The law places no limits on the amalgamation of property which is owned by citizens or the object of collective and state ownership, or on the formation of various mixed forms of ownership on this basis.

5. Ownership by foreign states, international organizations, and foreign legal entities and citizens, and ownership by joint enterprises involving Soviet and foreign legal entities can exist in the USSR in conformity with the law.

6. Union republic legislation may provide for other forms of public ownership and ownership by citizens not covered by the present Law.

7. The contract employment of labor in conformity with USSR and union republic legislation is permitted in the exercise of ownership rights.

Article 6. Common Ownership

1. Property may be owned as common property by several persons simultaneously, regardless of the form of ownership.

2. Common property may be shared (with definition of each owner's share of the property) or, in cases provided for by law or contract, joint (without definition of shares).

3. Procedures governing the possession, utilization, and disposal of property in common ownership are laid down by an agreement between the owners or, in the event of them being unable to reach agreement, by the courts, the State Board of Arbitration, or a court of arbitration.

Article 7. Ownership on Lease

1. Any output produced by a lessee using leased property and any income earned by the lessee are his property.

2. Leased property is owned by the lessor and may, subject to his consent, be fully or partially bought by the lessee with the exception of land and other natural resources.

Article 8. Claims on Property Owners' Property

1. Enterprises, associations and organizations, cooperatives, economic partnerships, and joint-stock companies are liable for their obligations to the full extent of their property.

The state is not liable for obligations incurred by enterprises, associations, organizations, economic partnerships, and joint-stock companies, nor are they liable for the state's obligations.

2. Citizens are liable for their obligations to the extent of property belonging to them as owners and of their shares in common property.

A list of citizens' property which cannot be subject to claims by creditors is laid down by union republic legislation.

Section II. Property of USSR Citizens

Article 9. General Provisions Relating to Citizens' Property.

1. Citizens' property is their personal property and is used by them at their own discretion to satisfy their various material and spiritual needs or for the purpose of independently conducting economic activity.

2. The strengthening and increasing of personal property is ensured by citizens converting into property their labor income from participation in social production, from the conduct of their own economic activity, from resources invested in credit institutions, shares, and other securities, or by the transfer of property to citizens through inheritance.

3. Any citizen of the USSR has the exclusive right to use his abilities for productive and creative labor. The citizen exercises this right independently or by entering voluntarily into labor-hire relations.

4. Any property accumulated by spouses during their married life is their common, joint property.

5. Citizens' right to inherit property is recognized and protected by the law.

Article 10. Objects of Citizens' Ownership Right

Citizens' property may include a residential house or apartment acquired from state, cooperative, or other housing stock, a dacha, small garden house, plants grown in a plot of land, monetary savings, shares, and other securities, household objects and items for personal use, and the means of production for use in a subsidiary plot, horticulture, truck gardening, and individual and other economic activity.

The composition and value of property acquired by the citizen using his own labor income and savings and on other grounds provided for by the law are not restricted.

Article 11. Property of Labor Partnership

1. The property of members of a family and other persons jointly conducting a labor partnership may include economic premises, machinery, equipment, raw materials and other materials used for the purpose of production and the preparation of output, and also any other property needed for independent economic activity.

2. The property of a labor partnership, including the output it produces, is the common, shared property of members of the family and other persons involved in the partnership, unless the agreement between them stipulates otherwise.

Article 12. Property of Peasant Farm

1. A peasant farm may have among its property a residential house, economic premises, productive and working livestock, poultry, agricultural equipment and implements, means of transport, and other property for the purpose of independent agricultural production.

Land is to be made available either on the basis of lifelong, inheritable possession, or on a lease basis for the purpose of operating the peasant farm.

The property of the peasant farm includes the output it produces, which it may dispose of at its own discretion.

2. The property of the peasant farm belongs to its members on the basis of the right to common, joint ownership, unless stipulated otherwise by the legislation of the union republic concerned or an agreement between the members of the farm.

Section III. Collective Ownership

Article 13. General Provisions Relating to Collective Ownership

1. Collective ownership includes the common property of collectives of working people and other collective formations combining their labor and resources for joint economic or other activity.

2. Members of collectives of working people and other collective formations either directly or through bodies they themselves have established decide the procedure and areas of use of this collective property and are involved in the management of collective property and the distribution of income from the economic activity of the collective.

3. The formation and development of collective property is ensured by transferring objects of state property to a lease or into the full economic control of collectives of working people and by providing them with the possibility to use their income for the purchase of state property and to set up associations, enterprises, and organizations of working people on shared, share, and joint-stock principles.

Article 14. Property of the Labor Collective of a Sta Enterprise

1. The labor collective shares in the right of common ownership of the property of a state enterprise. That share is formed from part of the profit derived from the enterprise's economic activity. The labor collective's share also includes the property acquired by it or transferred to it by others and resources freely contributed by members of the labor collective.

The extent of profit (income) which belongs to the labor collective and of losses applicable to its share in the property of the enterprise shall be determined by joint decision of the state property management organ and of the labor collective. Disputes which arise when determining the aforementioned share of profit (income) shall be examined by the State Board of Arbitration.

The property of the state enterprise shall include the proportion of the labor collective's property and the proportion of state property.

2. The property belonging to the labor collective is determined by the scale of contributions of all members of the labor collective to the creation of that property through individual labor input as well as financial and other material contributions by the labor collective member. The size of the labor collective member's contribution shall be fixed annually in the manner prescribed by the labor collective.

Interest shall be payable annually on the investments of labor collective members at a rate determined by the labor collective. The income of labor collective members in the form of interest may be used by its members as they see fit. A member of a labor collective who has terminated his labor relations shall retain the right to receive interest on his contribution. If the enterprise is disolved, the labor collective member's contribution shall be repaid to him in the form of money or securities.

3. Should all the property of the enterprise be transferred to the labor collective it shall, on the decision of the labor collective, be transformed into an association of working people (collective enterprise), a cooperative, an economic partnership, or a joint stock company.

4. Depending on the characteristics of their management, some enterprises (groups of enterprises) under all-union ownership, the ownership of union republics or autonomous formations, or municipal [kommunalnyy] ownership do not have labor collective property. The categories of such enterprises (groups of enterprises) which are under all-union ownership shall be established by the USSR Council of Ministers and with regard to enterprises owned by union republics or autonomous formations or under municipal ownership by the relevant Soviets of People's Deputies and state organs appointed by them.

Article 15. Property of an Association of Working People (Collective Enterprise)

1. The property of an association of working people (collective enterprise) shall include fixed assets and circulating capital, its output, revenue from the activity of the association, and other property which supports the independent economic activity and development of the association of working people (collective enterprise).

2. The property of the association of working people (collective enterprise) shall be formed by the transformation of the property of state enterprises' labor collectives, the redemption of leased property, and the acquisition of assets by other means envisaged by the law.

3. The property of an association of working people (collective enterprise) belongs to the collective of that enterprise as a whole. All workers of an association of working people shall participate in the management of collective assets and in the distribution of the association's income. The share of a worker in the association of working people in that income shall be determined by his labor contribution to the creation of the association's assets. The procedure and conditions for fixing the scale of that share and the exercise of workers' rights to it shall be determined by the association's statutes in accordance with the rules governing the distribution of the labor collective's property among working people as laid down by Article 14 of the present law.

The worker's share in the association of working people's income is directly dependent on the results of its activity, its profit and loss without maximum or minimum limits.

4. The association of working people (collective enterprise) shall provide the use of its assets for the creation of new jobs and working conditions for workers and employees in the manner prescribed by the law of the USSR and union republics with regard to state enterprises.

Article 16. Cooperatives' Property

1. Production facilities and other items it needs to carry out statutory tasks and also its products are the property of the cooperative.

Depending on the nature of the cooperative's activities, production facilities can include buildings, installations, equipment, transport, productive and working livestock, and other items. The assets of enterprises and organizations created by it are also the property of the cooperative.

2. The cooperative's assets are created as a result of the members' financial and material input, its products, the income obtained from their sale, and other activity provided for in the cooperative's statutes.

3. A union (association) of cooperatives owns the assets voluntarily handed over to it by the cooperatives that are members of the union. The union (association) has no right of ownership over the assets of the member copoperatives.

4. The assets remaining after the liquidation of a cooperative are distributed among the members of the cooperative unless otherwise stated in USSR and union republic legislation.

Article 17. The Property of Economic Partnerships

1. The assets of an economic partnership, operating as a legal entity, are made up of the participants' contributions and are its property.

2. The contribution of the partnership's participants may include production and nonproduction capital, money and securities, and also the right to use assets or intellectual and industrial property.

3. The participants' contributions are equal, unless otherwise stated in the economic partnership's documents of association.

Article 18. The Property of a Joint-Stock Company

1. A joint-stock company is formed through the issue of shares amounting to the entire value of its statutory capital.

A state enterprise, if the labor collective so decides, may be turned into a joint-stock company through the issue of shares to the full balance-sheet value of the enterprises' assets. The money obtained as a result of the sale of shares in this case passes to the state.

A state joint-stock company is a joint-stock company all of whose shares belong to state organs, enterprises, organizations, or institutions.

2. A joint-stock company is the owner of the assets created through participants' contributions and also obtained as a result of its activity and acquired by it in other ways provided for in legislation.

3. State organs, enterprises, organizations, institutions, cooperative and other public organizations, working people's associations (collective enterprises), and joint-stock companies may be shareholders.

4. Citizens may participate in a joint-stock company unless otherwise stated in USSR or union republic legislation.

5. Participation in a joint-stock company by foreign legal entities is possible in cases and in the form stipulated by USSR or union republic legislation.

Article 19. The Property of Economic Associations

1. An economic association (concern, consortium, union, intersectoral or regional association) is entitled to own the assets handed over to it voluntarily on a contractual basis by enterprises and organizations.

2. An economic association does not have the right to own the assets of its member enterprises and organizations.

3. The assets remaining after an economic association has ceased to function are distributed among the member enterprises and organizations.

Article 20. Public Organizations' Property

1. A public organization can own buildings, installations, machinery, equipment, cultural and educational facilities, and other assets essential to its political, scientific and cultural-educational, ecological, and other statutory functions. A public organization can also own the enterprises created by it in accordance with the nature of its activity and statutory tasks.

2. The assets of a union (association) of public organizations are owned by these organizations unless otherwise stated by their statutes (provisions) or other documents of association.

3. The assets remaining after the liquidation of a public organization are used for the purposes stated in its statutes.

Article 21. Religious Organizations' Property

Religious organizations can own buildings, religious objects, production and social facilities and charitable operations, money, and other assets essential to their activities.

Religious organizations are entitled to own assets purchased, built, created, or produced by them using their own resources, donated by believers, or handed over by the state or other persons or acquired in other ways stated in legislation.

Section IV. State Ownership

Article 22. State-owned Property—the Property [dostoyaniye] of Soviet Citizens

1. State-owned property is the property of Soviet citizens and belongs to the Soviet people as a whole and to the

people of union republics, autonomous republics, and other autonomous formations and administrative-territorial formations.

2. The management and control of the land and other natural resources, and also of property which is under unionwide ownership, the ownership of a union republic, autonomous republic, or other autonomous formation, or municipal ownership, are exercised on behalf of the people by the corresponding soviets of people's deputies and the state organs authorized by them.

3. Soviet citizens have an inalienable right to use state-owned property, in accordance with the procedure laid down by the law, in their common and personal interests, and to participate in the management of public property through soviets of people's deputies and social self-management organs and directly by means of referendums.

4. The strengthening and development of state-owned property are ensured by means of the thrifty use of state property and social and state monitoring of the safekeeping of public property.

5. Property created or acquired from the budgetary or other resources of the USSR, the union or autonomous republic, kray, oblast, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug, rayon, or city, or enterprises, organizations, or institutions under their jurisdiction is classified respectively as unionwide property, the property of the union republic, autonomous republic, or other autonomous formation, or municipal property.

Article 23. Land and Other Natural Resources as Public Property

1. The land and other natural resources are the inalienable property of Soviet citizens and belong to the peoples living in a given territory and to the Soviet people as a whole.

As a result of the unification of the Soviet peoples in a federation, the land and other natural resources belonging to them make up a single territory which forms the basis of the USSR's sovereignty.

2. A union republic owns, enjoys, and manages the land and other natural resources on its territory, while safeguarding the rights of each of the republic's peoples to keep and to use autonomously the natural wealth belonging to them.

An autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug, or other autonomous formation owns, enjoys, and manages the land and other natural resources on its territory.

The USSR owns, enjoys, and participates in the management of land and other natural resources necessary for meeting unionwide and interrepublican needs and ensuring the country's defense and security.

A union republic owns, enjoys, and participates in the management of land and other natural resources necessary for meeting the needs of the whole republic that are located on the territory of an autonomous formation forming part of the republic. The procedure for making natural resources available for these purposes is defined by agreement between the union republic and the autonomous formation in question.

3. The unionwide principles governing the use and protection of natural resources are laid down by USSR legislation.

The procedure for making land and other natural resources available is defined by the legislation of union republics, and, in the case of meeting unionwide and interrepublican needs and ensuring the country's defense and security, by the legislation of the USSR and union republics on the use and protection of natural resources.

Powers relating to the management of land for agricultural use, including powers to make land available for leasing, are exercised by rayon and city soviets of people's deputies.

4. Land and other natural resources are made available for use for payment, provided that no other provision is made by legislation of the USSR or of union or autonomous republics or acts of the soviets of people's deputies of other autonomous formations.

Article 24. Unionwide Ownership

Enterprises and national economic complexes of basic sectors in industry, construction, the power industry, and communications, maritime, railroad, and air transportation, main pipelines, the property of the Armed Forces and defense facilities, cultural and historical assets belonging to the whole people, unionwide reserve, insurance, and other funds, union budget funds, the USSR State Bank, and other USSR banks, as well as other property designated for the fulfillment of unionwide and interrepublican functions invested in the USSR, come under unionwide ownership.

Article 25. Ownership by Union Republics and Autonomous Formations

1. Property owned by an autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug, or other autonomous formation consists of enterprises and territorial complexes in industry, construction, and agriculture, the cultural and historical assets of the people of the autonomous formation, the property of trade and consumer service enterprises and public education and health care institutions, budget funds, and other property necessary for the implementation of the tasks facing the autonomous formation.

Article 26. Municipal Ownership

Property owned by the kray, oblast, rayon, or city (municipally owned property) consists of the housing stock and the housing and municipal amenities of local

soviets of people's deputies, local transportation, trade, and consumer service enterprises, and public education, culture, and health care institutions, as well as enterprises and production complexes of local significance in industry, construction, and agriculture, local budget funds, and other property necessary for the implementation of the tasks facing the kray, oblast, rayon, or city in question.

Article 27. Property of a State Enterprise

1. Property which comes under state ownership and is assigned to a state enterprise belongs to it on the basis of the right of full economic control [na prave polnogo khozyaystvennogo vedeniya].

In exercising the right of full economic control over its property, an enterprise owns, enjoys, and manages the said property and at its own discretion carries out any actions with regard to that property that are not contrary to the law or to the objectives of the enterprise's activity. The rules of ownership rights apply to the right of full economic control, unless the law stipulates otherwise.

2. The state organs authorized to manage state-owned property handed over to the enterprise for full economic control decide questions of creating the enterprise and defining the objectives of its activity and placing orders for the production of output (work, services) at the enterprise in accordance with stipulated procedure, monitor the safekeeping of state-owned property entrusted to the enterprise, and exercise other powers in accordance with legislation on the enterprise.

3. The state does not have the right to confiscate from an enterprise its fixed capital, circulating capital, or other property used in production, except in cases specified in legislative acts of the USSR and union republics.

4. State enterprises, irrespective of whether their property comes under unionwide ownership, ownership by the union republic, autonomous republic, or other autonomous formation, or municipal ownership, participate in the socioeconomic development of the territory on which they are located. The forms and extent of such participation are defined by a contract concluded by the enterprise with the appropriate soviets of people's deputies.

5. The reorganization or closure of a state enterprise, except in cases where an enterprise ceases to exist as a result of financial insolvency (bankruptcy), may be carried out by a joint decision of the enterprise's labor collective and the state management organ. Disputes on questions of the reorganization or closure of state enterprises are resolved by the State Board of Arbitration.

6. Where the assets of an enterprise include property owned by the labor collective, that property is held in state-collective ownership on a common-share basis until such time as it is bought out in full by the labor collective.

Fixed and circulating capital and output produced by an enterprise shall be under the full economic control of the enterprise when it is a question of common state-collective ownership of these assets.

Control over the housing stock, children's and convalescent institutions, sports facilities, and other facilities created using the funds of an enterprise labor collective and utilized to meet the social needs of labor collective members shall be exercised at the decision of the labor collective. Enterprise administrations provide management and ensure that these assets are utilized under a procedure agreed with the labor collective.

7. State enterprises are guaranteed protection for their rights with regard to assets under their full economic control, as well as with regard to the owner of the assets, along with the protection afforded the right of ownership under civil legislation.

Article 28. Assets Held by State Institutions.

1. Assets belonging to the USSR, union republics, autonomous republics, and other autonomous formations or administrative and territorial formations and vested [zakreplennyy] by the owner in a state institution (organization) maintained out of the state budget shall be under the operational control of that institution (organization), which shall exercise its right to control, utilize, and dispose of it within the limits laid down by the law and in line with the goals of its activity, its plan targets, and the purpose of the assets.

State institutions and other organizations maintained out of the state budget spend their monetary funds in line with ratified financial estimates. The USSR, union republics, autonomous republics, and other autonomous formations or administrative and territorial formations which are the owners of assets vested in a state institution (organization) are entitled at their discretion to reclaim those assets or redistribute them among subordinate departmental institutions (organizations), unless the contrary is stipulated by USSR or union republic legislation.

2. State institutions and other organizations maintained out of the state budget which are allowed to carry out economic activity in cases stipulated by USSR and union republic legislation shall be entitled to dispose independently of the income generated by such activity and of the assets acquired with this income.

Section V. Property Owned by Joint Ventures, and by Foreign Citizens, Organizations, and States

Article 29. Property Owned by Joint Ventures With the Participation of Soviet and Foreign Legal Persons

The buildings, installations, equipment, monetary funds, other material assets included in the statutory capital, output produced, income received, and other assets needed to carry out the operations of a joint venture, organization, or association stipulated by its constituent documents constitute the property of joint ventures,

organizations, or associations set up by Soviet and foreign legal persons on Soviet territory.

Article 30. Property Owned by Foreign Citizens.

Articles 9-12 of this law and other civil legislation on property owned by Soviet citizens shall apply to property located in the USSR and owned by foreign or stateless citizens.

Article 31. Property Owned by Foreign Citizens and Organizations for the Purposes of Economic Activity

Foreign organizations and citizens are entitled to own industrial and other enterprises, buildings, installations, and other property located on Soviet territory for the purposes of conducting economic activity in cases and following the procedure laid down by USSR and union republic legislation.

Article 32. Property Owned by Foreign States and International Organizations

Foreign states and international organizations are entitled to control, including the right of ownership, assets in the USSR necessary for the implementation of diplomatic, consular, and other international relations in cases and following the procedure laid down by international treaties signed by the USSR and in Soviet legislation, and observing the generally accepted norms of international law.

Section VI. Guarantees and Protection for the Right of Ownership

Article 33. Equal Protection for Ownership Rights

The state ensures, by law and in the application of legislation, equal conditions for state, cooperative, and public organizations, economic partnerships, citizens, joint enterprises, and other owners as regards methods, means, and forms for the protection of ownership rights.

Article 34. Impermissibility of Expropriation of an Owner's Property

Expropriation of property from an owner by the state is not permitted, except in cases when such expropriation is effected on grounds and according to procedures laid down by USSR and union republic legislative acts to promote state or social interests with indemnity for any loss caused by such expropriation, or by way of punishment for a crime or of sanction for a breach of administrative rules.

Article 35. Guarantees of the Stability of Ownership Relations

1. The state guarantees the stability of ownership relations laid down by this law.

2. Any acts by organs of state administration or local organs of state power running contrary to this law may be adjudged inoperative by a court at the request of the owner and other persons whose rights to possess, utilize, and dispose of the property in question would be groundlessly terminated or infringed as a result of the adoption of such acts.

Any losses caused to such persons as a result of the promulgation of such acts are liable to be compensated in full from funds at the disposal of the relevant organ of power or management.

3. In the event of the USSR or a union republic's adopting legislative acts terminating or restricting ownership rights, any owner who has suffered property damage as a result of such acts is entitled to file with a court a suit against the state seeking compensation for his losses.

Supreme Soviet Session Agenda Outlined

LD2011093289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet continues its work in Moscow today. At 1000, people's deputies will gather in the Kremlin for a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities. It is assumed that all this week our parliament will sit in plenary sessions. It looks like being busy days, full of events. Important bills prepared for debate at the end of last week, including some from Saturday prepared by the committees of the Supreme Soviet and commissions of its chambers, will have to be examined. They include the bill on the general foundations of management of the economy and social sphere in the union republics, questions of regulations of the Congress of People's Deputies and Supreme Soviet, draft foundations of legislation on lease and lease relations in the USSR, and a number of other important documents, all of which have been provisionally included on the agenda of the Supreme Soviet for this week.

Managerial Principles To Be Viewed

LD2011075989 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament again met today for a joint sitting of the two houses, presided over by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities.

The deputies will discuss a bill dealing with general principles for managing the economic and social spheres in the union republics.

The second session of the parliament is expected to end on Friday, November 24, but in the meantime the deputies are to consider a number of important bills including those on lease arrangements and land.

Economic Bill Discussion Postponed

LD2011133489 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Today's discussion in the Soviet parliament on a bill dealing with general principles for managing economic and social spheres in the union and autonomous republics centered on the question of how to broaden the economic independence of the Soviet republics and at the same time not to divide the country's economy into loosely connected components.

When first discussing the bill in the middle of October, the deputies considered it not radical enough and returned it to committees and commissions for additional consideration.

Today Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin introduced a new version.

However, when working on it the government and parliamentary bodies failed to reach accord on a number of points this time as well. The Committee for Local Governing Councils and the Commission for the Development of the Union and Autonomous Republics believe that the bill does not take into account the interests of the republics and autonomous entities well enough.

The discussion showed that this point of view was shared by many deputies. Speakers pointed out that the bill keeps the diktat of the centre, because key branches of the economy remain under the union's authority.

The bill runs counter to efforts towards broadening the rights of enterprises and may lead only to the replacement of the power of the union bureaucracy by the diktat of republican bureaucracy, speakers argued.

As a result, the USSR Supreme Soviet turned down a proposal to endorse the bill in the first reading. It was decided to instruct the standing parliamentary bodies to continue to work together with the government on this document and submit it for consideration at the parliament's spring session in 1990.

Political & Social

Georgian Supreme Soviet Reserves Right To Secede

LD1911175389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1642 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Tbilisi, 19 Nov (GRUZINFORM-TASS)—The session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet which finished today has adopted laws on amendments and additions to the republic's constitution, and on elections of people's deputies of the republic and local soviets. At the session of the parliament of this Transcaucasian Soviet republic, it was stressed more than once that the new documents take account of the interests of all levels of society. The amendments and additions to the constitution give the republic ownership, within its territorial boundaries, of the earth, its depths, water, forests, and other natural riches. All the basic means of production are also considered to be the national property of the republic.

Georgia is preserving for itself the right to freely secede from the USSR. The republic's Supreme Soviet suspends the force of laws and subordinate legislation of the USSR on its territory, if it deems that they do not meet its interests. Elections to the republican Supreme Soviet will be only from constituencies. There is no provision for elections from public organizations, as is customary with regard to people's deputies of the USSR.

The laws on elections proclaim that the right to vote in Georgia is enjoyed by every citizen of the republic irrespective of period of residence, origin and other conditions.

Deputies heard information about the work of their commission for a political and legal assessment of the violation of the treaty between Georgia and Soviet Russia of 7 May 1920. In the findings of the commission it says that from a legal point of view the introduction of troops into Georgia was an occupation with the aim of changing the existing political system. The session decided to place the matter of a political and legal assessment of this treaty before the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

The session heard the findings of the commission of the republican Supreme Soviet for investigating the events of 9 April 1989 in Tbilisi, when the rout of a demonstration by internal troops led to casualties.

Deputies discussed information from working groups on the elaboration of proposals for the introduction of the legal status of citizenship of Georgia, for the restoration of national military formations, and for the republic's conscripts to spend their military service on the territory of Georgia, for immigration processes in the republic, and for the implementation of the real sovereignty of the republic.

The plan for the economic and social development of Georgia and its budget for 1990 was approved.

Georgian Deputy Interviewed

LD1911225189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Nov 89

[From "Seven Days" newscast presented by Tikhomirov; video interview with Deputy L.L. Gogoberidze of the Georgian Supreme Soviet]

[Text] [L.L. Gogoberidze] One of the main ones is the law on property, on land, mineral resources, timber resources. The second law is the law on the right to freedly secede from the USSR—that is, about the guarantees for this secession. And the third law is also very significant, extraordinarily significant; it is the right to

suspend laws of the USSR if the Supreme Soviet again acknowledges that they are counter to the interests of the republic.

All this together created the feelings that we are really a genuine independent state. That is a little bit further than just sovereignty, you understand, the acknowledgement of sovereignty for an independent state which enters a federation on a voluntary basis. And if these steps will be taken in full, and if each republic really feels that, on a voluntary basis, on the basis of treaty, it takes part in a federation, then everything will change, and the there would be no grounds at all for the interethnic feuding and the relations which currently obtain. [video shows two women, one interviewing the other]

[Tikhomirov] I shall add that the deputies heard a report on the work of the Georgian Supreme Soviet commission on matters of a political and legal appraisal of the violation of the treaty between Georgia and Soviet Russia of 7 May 1920. The conclusion of the commission says: The introduction of troops into Georgia and the seizure of all her territory, from the legal aspect, was military interference, intervention, and occupation with the aim of changing the existing political system. From a political point of view, this action and the consequences ensuing from it, should be appraised as de facto annexation. The session approved the commission's conclusion, and it was decided to place the matter of the political and legal appraisal of the violation of the treaty mentioned before the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR.

Vorkuta Mine Strikes Continue

LD1911183689 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Republic November 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov:

Eight of the thirteen Vorkuta collieries were operating today, TASS was told by the Vorkutaugol (Coal) Association. Only two of the four coal faces were mined at the Promyshlennaya colliery.

It should be noted that days-off were scheduled for four of the mines in advance and it is impossible to say at the moment whether their miners will resume work or continue on strike.

There are no days-off at the shipping departments but five collieries have failed to resume shipments.

Late on Saturday, the city conference of strike committees and representatives of colliery work collectives ended in Vorkuta. The debates were fiery, especially when discussing the pivotal question: "What is to be done?" Opinions and proposals differed diametrically.

As a result, representatives of three mines voted for halting the strike, nine decided to continue stoppages.

The outcome of voting was explained by a city strike committee spokesman as follows: "Miners decided by a majority to continue striking until receiving the official documents of the meeting with Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov on November 17. The meeting considered the fulfilment of Government Resolution No 608.

"The striking miners need specific documents about the resolution of questions they raised. The second condition for suspending the strike is to repeal the court ruling proclaiming the strike illegal and imposing fines on the organisers and participants".

This last demand referred to the decision of the Komi Republican Supreme Court which ruled that the strikes at a number of collieries of the Vorkutaugol (Coal) Association were unlawful.

The Supreme Court of the Russian Federation found no reason to revise the ruling. The other day, the Supreme Court of the Komi Republic considered and satisfied pleas from the managements of some Vorkuta mines claiming damages from the strike committees and other organisers of the strike.

There is no more unity among the miners in Vorkuta. This was clear from some collectives refusing to obey the decision of yesterday's conference—some are working, others have suspended the strike.

Status of Mines

LD1811210189 Moscow TASS in English 2039 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Northern Russia, November 18 TASS—Part of striking miners of this polar city have resumed work. Officials from the Vorkutaugol amalgamation told TASS that nine Vorkuta mines out of 13 were extracting coal today and eight of them were dispatching coal to consumers.

However, the Ayach-Yaga and Yuzhnaya mines are supplying coal only to the city's central heating-and-power plant. In the Oktyabrskaya mine, only two sections out of four were working this afternoon.

The decision of miners to resume work was prompted by reports from Moscow on a meeting of Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and other government members with miners.

Members of Vorkuta strike committees said the government had sent an urgent telegram to Vorkuta miners, saying the government on Friday met representatives of Vorkuta miners and discussed issues raised by the latter.

Principled decisions were taken on these issues and an agreement was reached that corresponding documents will be prepared on them.

The issues include "north bonuses" to wages and preferential length of service for work underground.

Although the amount of coal produced and dispatched by the Vorkuta mines in the past day was somewhat greater than earlier in November, production plans were not fulfilled.

In November, Vorkuta miners have hoisted almost 627,000 tons of coal less than planned and failed to supply more than 663,000 tons to consumers.

Many of Vorkuta coal consumers are in an extremely difficult position. Enterprises and boiler-houses heating villages and towns are on the verge of being stopped.

The Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic had a visiting session in Vorkuta on Friday. It granted suits for damages and sanctions, brought by the administrations of a number of Vorkuta mines against strike committees and other organisers of the strike, which was recognised as illegal.

Some miners express discontent with the court decision.

Strike committees and representatives of work collectives of Vorkuta mines began a city conference Saturday night.

Only 3 Pits Working

AU1811205289 Paris AFP in English 1944 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 17 (AFP)—Three weeks into the miners' strike, which has paralyzed most of the Vorkuta coalfield in the Soviet Arctic, television Saturday reported a back-to-work movement in nine out of 13 pits. But one of the strike leaders, Sergey Kozlov, in Moscow for talks with government officials about miners' demands, told AFP that only three pits were working and that government officials had failed to make good their promises.

TASS news agency said work had resumed in some of the mines after news was received from Moscow concerning a meeting held Friday between Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and miners' representatives. In a telegram, the government promised to examine problems raised by the strikers, including bonuses for Arctic workers and better living conditions, TASS said.

But Mr. Kozlov said miners were divided over the government's response, many wanting an official document rather than just oral promises before recommending a return to work. Talks with the government were expected to resume on Monday, he added.

The strike has been declared illegal by Soviet courts. Meanwhile, the government is setting up regional commissions in other mining areas to oversee implementation of promises made by the authorities to miners during last summer's nationwide strike. The commissions will include miners, local and government officials, TASS said.

Ryzhkov, Others Meet With Miners 17 Nov

Ryzhkov Addresses Miners

PM1811220589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[D. Valovoy report: "Open Discussion. On N.I. Ryzhkov's Meeting With Miners"]

[Excerpt] On 6 November the press published an appeal by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to the leaders and labor collectives of the country's coal basins, which stated that on 17 November the head of government would have a meeting with the participation of representatives of the labor collectives of the coal basins, at which the progress in implementing Resolution No 608 of the Council of Ministers would be examined. Serious preparations were made for the meeting. The very fact that it has been held is a vivid example, and the result of perestroyka and of the firm establishment of new principles of interrelations between workers and leaders. There was an open, constructive discussion by the representatives of the mining collectives and the head of government at the meeting. What was discussed? [passage omitted]

Concluding the conference, N.I. Ryzhkov said:

"In my opinion, following today's conference, we have to set up in the next few days a plenipotentiary commission or teams, region by region, which will keep an eye on the progress in really fulfilling resolution No 608. These teams will include representatives of the worker collectives of all the country's coal basins. They must be endowed with powers such that they can really, first, monitor the fulfillment of the set targets and, second, make appropriate adjustments where necessary. They must be permanently functioning teams. Locally—in the Kuzbass, for example—the team members must be in direct contact with the miners. Then there will be no misunderstandings, which arise because of a lack of glasnost. The commissions in the regions must work under normal conditions, and it is necessary to rule out pressure on them by means of strikes. And this will be done. I would ask you, comrades, on dispersing to the provinces, to tell the people: Yes, we spoke about the matter and leveled complaints at each other, and there are many complex questions which cannot be resolved in a single hour, but let us give an undertaking that we will work and resolve questions in a businesslike way and seek agreement through dialogue, while striking means merely exacerbating the situation and leading it into an impasse. Give the government an opportunity to work confidently and to resolve urgent questions in a considered manner, on a healthy, constructive basis."

The speakers at the conference spoke of the politicization of the working-class movement. This is a separate question, N.I. Ryzhkov said in this regard, but it must be touched on if we have agreed that ours is a frank discussion, regardless of posts and ranks. I want to share this thought with you frankly: Do you not think that

certain groups are using you for mercenary purposes which are alien to you? They are people who argue: The worse things are in the state, the better it is and the more chance they have of asserting their political ambitions. They are reckoning on destabilizing society and seizing power by disrupting the normal rhythm of life. And using the strength of the working-class movement as a lever, as a tool. You must realize this, in order not to become a tool of political extremists.

Cooperative members V.A. Tikhonov and A.M. Tarasov traveled to you in Vorkuta. I read very attentively the speech of Comrade Tikhonov, president of the USSR Union of United Cooperatives. I believed that the leaders of the cooperative movement were traveling to the coal region to help the city folk with fruit, vegetables, and consumer goods. It is for this—to help the state sector—that cooperatives have been reconstituted But there was no question of helping with goods. The cooperative members' leaders said: You are fighting the government and are right to do so. Is this really the business of cooperative members? They must mind their own business. I was amazed when they were almost borne shoulder-high in Vorkuta. I speak of all this so that you realize who really seeks to help the working class and to resolve your regions' urgent problems and who is trying to use you.

The meeting participants pointed to the importance and the usefulness of the dialogue that had taken place, as a result of which an action program was drawn up. It was deemed expedient to amplify individual points of resolution No 608 and, where necessary, to make amendments to it. A decision was adopted to change the existing system of monitoring the fulfillment of mutual pledges and to elaborate in greater depth certain points of this resolution with due regard for the overall changes stemming from the radical economic reform. Mindful of the importance of the problems raised by the miners, it is planned to examine them in the very near future at a session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium, devoting special attention to the priority tasks stemming from resolution No 608 and to the enhancement of personal responsibility for the fulfillment of all assignments given.

"Despite the fact that today's discussion has been complex and difficult for me," N.I. Ryzhkov said in conclusion, "I believe that there was a great need for it. This exchange of opinions will enable me better to know the state of affairs and, most importantly, to outline ways to improve the situation in the coal sector and to accelerate the fulfillment of the decisions on which we have agreed. I wish to thank you for such a constructive discussion, and I hope that you and I will continue working amicably and resolving common tasks."

The conference participants continued their work 18 November on resolving specific questions of coal industry enterprises with deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers and at the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, and other ministries and departments.

Members of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium, USSR people's deputies, leaders of a number of ministries, departments, and local organs of power, and directors of mines and associations participated in the meeting with miners.

Discuss Current Situation

LD1811172789 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and members of the government held a scheduled meeting with the representatives of miners in the Kremlin on November 17, to discuss the fulfillment of Resolution No 608 of the USSR Council of Ministers, dated August 3, 1989, and the current situation in the country's coal-producing regions.

The meeting was marked by sharp, but at the same time, constructive discussion of urgent probelms. Not a single vital area was left out. At the same time miners were criticised over the fulfillment of mutual obligations under the joint decisions of government commissions and representatives of labour collectives. Due to work stoppages, the coal industry failed to deliver 14 million tons of coal to consumers, including 1.2 million tons to the population.

The miners criticised in their speeches the failure to implement some of the provisions of the government resolution fully and timely. In connection with the delay in dealing with acute health and medical service poblems, Soviet Health Minister Yevgeniy Chazov dwelt on specific measures aimed at improving the situation in the coal-producing areas.

Replying to sharp criticism for the work of railways, Minister Nikolay Konarev reported on measures to ensure the shipment of coal, pit props, equipment and materials required for the normal work of mines.

Although the general tone of the speeches was critical, the miners called for the stabilisation of the situation and the resumption of uninterrupted work in coal mines.

Participants in the meeting pointed to the importance and usefulness of the dialogue which helped work out a programme of action.

They deemed it advisable to specify some provisions of Resolution No. 608 and amend it, if necessary. A decision was taken to change the existing system of control over the fulfilment of mutual obligations, and to improve some provisions of the resolution.

To this end, it was decided to set up regional commissions of plenipotentiaries of the government, local authorities and miners' work collectives.

The commissions' objectives will be to exercise control over the fulfilment of the decisions taken and analyse and tackle all problems connected with the development of each specific coal basin.

Summing up results of the meeting, Ryzhkov said that the government "regards the needs of miners and the development of the coal industry as a whole with understanding."

He said a number of the issues raised at the meeting were of a "principled, future-oriented nature."

The issues included changes in the organisational structure of the coal industry management, the transition of mines and regions to cost-accounting, changes in wholesale coal prices, and the comprehensive development of miners' towns and settlements.

All these issues will be thoroughly analysed and decisions will be taken on them, taking into account general changes stemming from the radical economic reform, Ryzhkov said.

Taking into account the importance of the problems raised by the miners, it was decided to submit them for consideration of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers in the near future.

Participants in the meeting on Saturday [18 November] met the prime minister's deputies and officials from the Ministry of Coal Industry and other ministries and departments to solve specific problems faced by coal miners.

Moscow TV Airs Meeting

LD1911205189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Report by Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy on 17 November Kremlin meeting between USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay I. Ryzhkov and miners; with recorded remarks by participants]

[Excerpts] [Ryzhkov] Esteemed comrades, we are glad to welcome you in the government for today's meeting of miners, which is taking place in the Kremlin and which is attended by representatives of practically all our country's coal basins. We have decided to devote today to a consideration of matters connected with our miners' situation. The principle goal of our meeting, our conference, concerns the fact that there have been very many approaches recently from labor collectives in different coal regions requesting that the government, under the chairmanship of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, examine the progress of fulfilment of Decision No 608. We closely examined these requests in early November. You will know that a telegram was sent out—you were made aware of it—in which we proposed to meet in the Kremlin on the 17th and, as the phrase goes, exchange views and objectively assess the progress of the fulfilment of this decision. The second task we faced at today's conference is to define the position on the further operation of our state's coal basins and to find ways of stabilizing our work so we might work normally and normally fulfill our obligations to the people, so to speak, and, overall, that we might move forward in the social and economic development of the country. [video shows Ryzhkov addressing audience in a Kremlin hall]

[Voznesenskiy] The Council of Ministers chairman recalled that Decision No 608 was the result of joint work by the government, ministries, departments and representatives of labor collectives, and one could say it became a policy document. It included points of primary importance, such as pensions and leave.

[Ryzhkov] We have strictly fulfilled our obligations. On 21 October we proposed a draft law on pensions, and on 10 November we proposed the law on leave. These two basic laws alone will cost the state around R40 billion. To give you an idea of whether this is a large or small figure, I would like to recall that in the past 5- year plan period, in the one before that, and in this 5-year plan period we planned to spend, we did spend approximately R15-16 billion of the state budget on centralized measures, measures undertaken for the people by the state. Those are the relative proportions—R16 billion and R40 billion for just two laws. I mention this because we must take a very serious and well-considered approach to the functioning of the country's national economy as a whole.

If we are going to work more effectively, if we are not going to work better than we used to work previously, then, you understand it yourselves, all our good intentions and perhaps good decisions we adopt or predetermine might be found to be completely impractical. These will further aggravate the overall situation in our country. That is why today, opening our sitting, our meeting, I would like to appeal to you that today we have a constructive discussion to talk frankly about all the deficiencies that exist, to find a solution today, and, most importantly, to leave today with a firm belief that we can solve those problems that miners have today. At the same time I propose the miners, will fulfill those pledges they undertook in the summer when we signed this decision.

You understand; we must speak frankly as we have mutual pledges. The government undertook the pledges and it bears the responsibility for them. The miners undertook obligations, and they must bear certain responsibilities for them as well. These are all interconnected points, as you will understand, and today we must talk frankly here.

[Voznesenskiy) Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov drew the attention of the participants of the meeting to the fact that now when the national economy is entering the most difficult time, the winter period, it has already received 14 million tonnes of coal less compared with the tasks. The reserves held by consumers, power engineering workers, metallurgical workers, and in all industries of

the national economy, have decreased by 4 million tonnes. All this is cause for serious concern, naturally. [passage omitted]

[Voznesenskiy] Mikhail Ivanovich Shchadov, the USSR Coal Industry Minister, supplied further information on the progress in implementing decision 608. In particular, he noted:

[Shchadov] For 1990, the main requirements as set out and recorded between the government commissions and the strike committees have been included in the state plan. In 1990, to tackle issues in the social sphere, the ministry has been allocated R1.25 billion for building and assembly work. The plan will be difficult to fulfill, but it can be fulfilled. If the comrades so wish, tomorrow I can report in detail on which issues will be tackled in each town and each oblast. We are not just talking about the construction of housing, but also healthcare facilities, preschool establishments for children, schools, hospitals, and polyclinics. For the 13th 5-year-plan period, the draft decisions on the Kuzbass, the Kazakh Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Rostov Oblast, and the Pechora coalfields have now been drawn up.

These draft decisions are with the ministry. We are working on them along with other ministries and departments, and in the near future they will be put to the USSR Council of Ministers before a decision is made. It should be said straight away that, while in the 12th 5-year-plan period, we have R2.77 billion to deal with issues connected with problems in the social sphere, in the 13th 5-year-plan R6 billion are already earmarked, in other words 2.2 times more than in the 12th 5-year-plan period.

I'd just like to say a couple of more words. The comrades are aware of this, and everyone in the provinces is worried about it. Although the situation with regard to providing enterprises with empty wagons improved somewhat in October, by and large, across the industry, this problem remains unresolved, and the miners of the Kuzbass—where at present there are around 13 million tonnes of coal—are in an extremely difficult position. The coal is on fire; its quality is deteriorating. And we are asking the miners for more coal. I have asked the Railways Ministry to resolve this problem. The mines of Krasnoyarsk Kray are also in difficulties, the workers there are, to put it frankly, sitting around for shifts on end and losing pay. The same goes for Ekibastuz and the Far East, and the same is starting to happen in Irkutsk. We know what the matter is. Comrades, we have worked out in detail the issue of material and technical provision with the ministers who are present here. I might say that on all the additional funds that have been allocated to us by the government in connection with tackling the issues raised by the strike committees and the government commissions and on the main fund, I might say that the ministers made strict pledges that those resources allotted to the ministry will be provided this year. I believe that when matters are summed up, it will only be necessary to observe that it has been noted that the ministers promise to provide the coal industry with all it needs in line with the allocated resources. [passage omitted]

[Voznesenskiy] USSR Health Minister Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov said that many of the miners' illnesses were examined by special commissions and have been classified as professional. [passage omitted] Then Yevgeniy Ivanovich was asked numerous questions. Thus, answering one of them, why is there no list of professional illnesses confirmed by the ministry in the provinces, Comrade Chazov said:

[Chazov] An order was issued by us on 29 September, by us...

[Audience] [Indistinct interjections]

[Chazov] Can I—allow me to finish. We understand that the situation is such, we even published in the newspaper IZVESTIYA this order, in the paper MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA we published this order: There is a complete supply of information. Moreover we had a meeting where people spoke. The minister of health of the Komi Soviet Socialist Republic was present at that meeting. Why did you not ask him?

[Voice from the audience] You have not answered why there are no basic things: Analgin, basic potassium permanganate. This is done basically. They were in abundance.

[Chazov] Okay, I will answer, that this question, as you know, was discussed not only by the government, it was discussed in the Supreme Soviet, it was discussed by other organizations. And, unfortunately, our pharmaceutical industry supplies the country with 40 percent, this, in my opinion, is known to everyone. For this reason a decision has now been made to purchase medicinal preparations abroad.

You say analgin: We buy analgin in Bulgaria; here I will show you directly, concretely a preparation. From Bulgaria 280 tonnes of analgin have now been purchased, which is now coming, and in the very near future we will supply it throughout the country.

[Ryzhkov] Yevgeniy Ivanovich, so that it should be completely clear on this point, for I feel that there really is a lot of passion on the subject of medicine: A decision has now been made to find, no matter how difficult it is, R500 million, foreign currency rubles, gold rubles, in order to buy additional medicines, and now they are beginning to reach the shops. But I would ask you the same, just look: How many enterprises which produce medicines, our own, are being closed today? Tens, and this is being done next to you. Well, I see here many people from the Ukraine, from the Donbass, and so on. Well ask Vitaliy Andreyevich Masol who is sitting here, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine, and he knows how many sections, which produce the same tablets, the same medicines, have been closed in the Ukraine. So let's do things properly. Maybe we

shouldn't at the moment be closing sections. We close sections and then say there is no analgin. [passage omitted]

[Voznesenskiy] A number of Karaganda workers who spoke talked about the fate of people who live in the area of the Semipalatinsk testing ground. These themes are present, for example, in the speech of (Balat Mukhadzhanov), member of the Karaganda oblast strike committee:

[Mukhadzhanov] I will not understate the situation. I will speak directly and honestly, as Nikolay Ivanovich spoke about this, openly. The situation around the testing ground is very tense. Such a tendency, that is open to someone to stir up an ethnic conflict, is noticeable, a second Nagorno-Karabakh. We, the working class, are not on the same path as such comrades; we do not need any ethnic conflicts. There is no point in the working class fighting among itself. I talked about this at the plenum of the trade union's central committee, and now I am talking about it here. I would ask the government to pay particular attention precisely to the situation around the testing ground. A commission of the central committee of the coal miners' union invited representatives from the town of Semipalatinsk, and namely from the nearest oblasts and rayons. As you have noticed a head man, with metal medals, is in the hall who has come and he will speak about this, that is in the name of the people of Semipalatinsk oblast and adjacent rayons. [passage omitted]

[Voznesenskiy] And then, Nikolay Semenovich Konarev, minister of railways [title as heard] spoke. [passage omitted]

[Konarev] I believe there is a way out. Those norm with which we now work must be made more rigid. And while industrial capacity is being increased, we will find open railcars. But what about today? They do not work on Saturdays; they do not work on Sundays; they do not work at night. In a week 188 hours. [as heard] It will surprise you to learn that transport works 188 hours, but of these 188 hours, it does not work 82 hours. I wish to say that responsibility has to be increased, so that railcars are unloaded on Saturdays and Sundays. Therefore, when our resources are limited, we need to resolve matters through compromise. But nonetheless, comrades, nontheless, I realize you have grounds for saying something and expressing dissatisfaction. Dear comrades, the Ministry for Railways understands and all railway workers understand the extent of the responsibility facing us to provide for the needs of the coal industry.

[Unidentified voice from the floor] Nikolay Semenovich, Comrade Ryzhkov's report mentioned a shortage of 14 million tonnes of coal. There are 14 million tonnes of coal lying in the Kuzbass. I realize that 5 million tonnes of that 14 million tonnes constitutes coal that is difficult to raise, that demands hydraulic mechanisms. But when are we going to transport the 9 million tonnes?

[Konarev] Well, let me define the information more precisely. At this moment in the Kuzbass there are 9 million tonnes, on the 13th there were 9.37 million tonnes, including, well, at all of the mines. Of those, over 3 million tonnes are not transportable. I have reported that we put the question thus. By 1 January we should not go over 7 million tonnes. That is in the Kuzbass. In the Kuzbass. That means the rate of removal each day will be about 7,000 railcars, in other words, what was required in accordance with Decision 608. [passage omitted]

[Voznesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov made a concluding address at the conference. Among other things, he said:

[Ryzhkov] The question arises: With what are we to end our meeting today? I understand that you will now go home. Well, tomorrow you will spend some time in Moscow; you will once again be sorting out a lot of individual matters, but then you will arrive back at your mines and in your regions and of course the people will ask you: What have you brought back from the conference? That is the main question. I will approach this problem as follows. If we—either I myself or Comrade Schadov for that matter might speak, I have a mass of notes and suggestions—if we say now that we will settle this point, that we will allocate additionally such and such a quantity of timber or such and such a quantity of cement and so on, well I do not think this is the kind of occasion where we should leave here with individual matters of that kind. I agree, they must be resolved and I call; we have instructed comrades that these specific issues shall be sorted out tomorrow. But, these specific aspects which have been mentioned here today, although they sometimes gave rise to sharp feelings on the part of some comrades along the lines of why are you bringing your own misfortunes here when there are misfortunes common to everyone, I think, nevertheless, that these do provide grounds upon which we can draw certain conclusions overall. I will put forward the following proposal: There is every likelihood that if we once again continue to monitor Decision No 608 in the way that we have done during these months then I think there will be misunderstandings between us the entire time. And do not think that the government is acting against the miners. I will ask you not to hold on to this unpleasant after-taste. I want us to live harmoniously with the miners. I want us to solve the tasks which face the country together with the miners. I want us, together with the miners, to move the country forward, and not stand still or, God forbid, roll back. My own opinion, therefore, is as follows. Over the course of several days after the conference we must think things through very seriously; we must set up—I do not know whether it will be a commission of some kind or teams, the important thing is not the name. Clearly, for each coal basin, major coal basin, we must place leaders especially authorized by the government, including ministries and departments working from the center. Further more, I believe that included in these integrated teams, if one may call

them such, there must be representatives of the workers from these regions, and that these integrated teams of important specialists and organizers of production should indeed be able in the first place to monitor Decision No 608. I am convinced that we will have to amend some things in this Decision No 608. And these integrated teams will have to work not for 5 days, not for 10 days. In the first place, they will have to work in a proper fashion and then they will evidently have to be operating on a permanent basis so that they can deal with things the whole time. If, say, there is a group or team dealing with the Kuzbass, we must know that the group is dealing with the Kuzbass. The people there must know them, and we must know them.

Then, evidently we will not have the situation we have today, when as we tear decision 608 to shreds, this point is being implemented in one region, while in another it is not. I believe that, in the given instance, of course, this will be the most suitable system for our further work. My one request—I ask that, if such a way of organizing the work is suitable—then my one request, comrades, is that any commission, any wonderful commission that we set up on a regional basis, to cover any region, must work in a normal atmosphere. It is impossible to work under pressure. If we again exert pressure by means of strikes, the downing of tools or what have you, then things just won't work. Again we will start to fret; again we'll start to hunt for unacceptable compromises; and again we'll—later on—assembly in this hall, and you'll say: Comrade Ryzhkov, why did we make such decisions? Why aren't they being implemented? and so, when all is said and done, let us think these issues over, so that they really can be implemented. That is my proposal. I believe we have a number of fundamental issues that must be tackled; they must be tackled. But I ask you that when we disperse today, or tomorrow, comrades, let us tell the people—and it is our duty to tell the people today—that, yes we had a chat; yes, we complained about one another; there are many unresolved issues. But let us tell them that we will work, but that we will tackle the issues, too. If we go our separate ways today and say: well, we'll see, we might carry on the strike for a bit; then I believe that will not get us out of the situation. It will prove to be a blind alley for us, a blind alley for all.

I ask you that, after today's meeting, we might really work calmly and confidently. You should work with confidence, and we should work with confidence. You should understand this. Do you really think the government is unaffected by this sort of instability? Give the government a chance to work with confidence, too. Give it the chance to examine the issues and tackle the issues.

And now some general matters. There is a great deal of talk today about the organizational structure of the coal industry. We are very seriously troubled by this issue. We realize that the way of organizing the administration that existed and operated a few years ago, apparently today, in the conditions of the new economic relations does not suit many people, although it is not clear-cut. Some say: We are happy with the system as it is; we are happy with associations, and so on. My opinion is that, if the present system suits people, let them work with it. Why should we upset the applecart? But today there are lots of proposals to set up concerns and associations, on financial autonomy and the independence of pits. I believe there is still a lot of work to be done on this. There is no definite stance.

So my view is that these groups of people, if one can call them that, which we are to create region by region, must include very knowledgeable specialists, so that step by step it may really be possible to get to grips with every mine: What we need to do, what conditions are to be given—that is, if a concern is being set up, on what conditions it should be done. All this evidently needs to be set out. So this is a real question, and we must work very seriously on it.

The prices issue. I realize it is one of the most acute questions and that without resolving it it is very difficult to organize financial autonomy. We have worked on this problem. We wanted to bring in new prices from 1990. But, owing to a number of circumstances, a number of reasons, and because of the lack of preparedness of the whole system, we have put it off for a year. Our opinion in the government is as follows. That in future financial autonomy and the new economic mechanism in general won't function in this country until we have resolved the question of wholesale and purchase prices. Our view is that it needs to be done in 1991. The degree to which prices must be increased for coal—calculations have to be made, preliminary calculations exist, and in 1990 we have to carry out very careful preparations.

The State Order issue. There are a very great many discussions taking place about the need to allow more coal to be sold and have smaller State Orders. In the government we recently specially considered this matter. I shall be quite frank with you. I think that we evidently have to approach the State Order question from a new position. What has happened in the country today? In the coal industry, say, the State Order for next year is 95 percent; for the oil industry it is 95 percent. For metallurgy—there it's 70 percent, but for machine-building it's 20 to 30 percent. And the result is that all branches of the national economy find themselves in unequal conditions. The following proposal has been made: That from 1991, say, the whole State Order system should be reviewed. If the State Order were to be set at 80 percent—and this is only by way of example—for all industries without exception within the national economy, be it coal, machine-building, oil and so on: But we then have to know that if we have set 80 percent identically for all, then we must know that 20 percent—the 20 percent that remains—we must then find for each other, that is to say we must create the start for a market of sorts.

There are a lot of questions about the strike committees. I understand that this is another question which also disturbs you and troubles you. I would approach this problem from the other end. What is our objective when

we talk about a permanently-operating strike commitee or other organization under a different name but of the same kind? Or about a committee operating temporarily for a particular period?

I understand how, from today's speeches, the conversation is about having definite bodies in the regions, at the mines, which could constantly follow the implementation of the decisions that were adopted. If one approaches things from this angle, I support the creation of such special bodies. I know that there are 54 people in Moscow who have been taken on, those who are checking the fulfilment of Decision 608. So we have 54. Let them live and prosper, and, while the Decision is in force, they will take an active part in monitoring it, in meetings and so on. If, say, it is necessary for us in the regions, and if a decision is taken to create these permanent teams or permanent groups, government groups in which many people are involved, then let us include those people in them too so that they may observe. Let us proceed from such positions.

I understand that indeed those active forces of the working class which exist can, and should, take an active part, but today—I know that this will evoke a varied reaction—if one forms permanent strike committees today, then, please understand, how generally is the country to live? Well, today there are permanent strike committees in the coal industry, tomorrow it will be metallurgy, machine-building and so on. And we only will threaten each other. Well, this simply makes it simply impossible to work normally. Therefore, we have opportunities to attract these healthy forces of the working class. Please, let us involve them so that they may actively check these processes. Let us involve the work collective councils, and the trade unions. I know that very many now have been elected by the trade union. We will support things from such positions. And we also have consulted with the trade union. I even happened to be speaking with Stepan Alekseyevich Shalayev, and I said: Listen, I see very many people with their wits about them; at long last, involve them in the trade union movement. Let there be some new blood. From such positions we should, I think, approach things so as indeed to use these people in order to create an opportunity to really improve the situation, so that these people may actively participate in this matter.

Many bitter words have been said today about the tax on wages. But let us look at the country as a whole. In the first 9 months, 2.2 percent more products have been made in the country than last year for this same period. Wages, incomes, all incomes increased by 12.2 percent: That is incomes got ahead by 10 percent. Therefore, generally, I think, the decision that was adopted was correct, correct. If one speaks in particular about the coal industry, I propose acting as follows: Let us instruct both our state committee on labor and wages and other central economic departments and Gosplan which here also are present, and let us thoroughly look into things.

Many questions have been asked today, comrades, about pensions and holidays. You have read the law on pensions. You will evidently express your attitude to this law. We believe that in all probability—I hope so at least—that the Supreme Soviet will adopt this law during the spring session. A certain time will be left for introducing it from 1 January 1991.

Now about the question of holidays. Questions have been asked here as to whether it will be possible already in 1990 to make some movement forward with regard to the question of leave. I am speaking honestly to you, to you all—and it is possible that it will get into our program which will be transmitted on the results of the meeting today—we cannot go for these things in 1990, we cannot. We have adopted many decisions on 1990 here on this rostrum and in this hall. God help us, as the saying goes, to implement the decisions that we have already adopted. Therefore, I do not want to deceive you. And I am calling upon you to restrain yourselves. Let us tackle this question from 1991 on.

Comrades, voices were heard here today, and some speakers spoke about the politicization of the working movement. I would not like to enter a debate on this question now. This is a separate question. And it must be discussed separately, too. But I cannot help dwelling on one problem. And since we have agreed that we would have an honest and frank conversations—and I have understood from the speeches that the conversation we had today has indeed been like this, notwithstanding the high posts and ranks, as it were—and I wish to tell you this honestly and frankly: Do you not think that you are being used by some, to put it crudely, groups and elements. I think that your are being used very much indeed. And I am convinced of this.

[Audience reaction] [Sentences indistinct] [Ryzhkov] You are being used. You are being used so that they can resolve their own problems. These are the people who wish to resolve their political ambitions by taking advantage of the state being in a worse situation, in other words, taking advantage of an interruption in the normal rhythm of life they wish to destabilize our society, and on this wave they wish to seized power, as the saying goes, or to lay some other claims. But at least this is precisely what, I think, is being pursued. They are using the working movement both as a lever and as an instrument. And you must understand this. And you hve to be good politicians to prevent them from using you as an tool. I am convinced that if this happens, and God forbid that it should, that you will be forgotten the next day. The next day you will be forgotten. This is how it will be. Just look for yourselves: Cooperative workers visited you in Vorkuta. Did they come? Yes, they did. I thought that the union of cooperative workers would arrive in the coal mining area and would say: We, cooperative members, have come to help you. We will provide you with fruit and vegetables and consumer goods. We will now mobilize the entire cooperative movement to help you in your troubles and make it possible for the market to be saturated in some way. This is what the cooperative

movement was created for, to render help of some kind to the state sector. I have not heard a single word like this from them. I have not heard a single word. And yet you all applauded. Because they were saying that you should struggle against the government. You are doing everything correctly. Put on pressure and so on. But is this up to the cooperative workers to engage in this matter, this question. They must deal with their own affairs. And I was generally astonished, astonished, when in Vorkuta cooperative workers were almost carried in their arms, while in Karaganda, when they were having their summer strike, and I know this, one of the demands was the closure of the cooperative movement. Did this happen? Yes, it did. So, I am citing these facts so that we can understand, nevertheless, that it is necessary, comrades, for us to see clearly where people truly wish to help the working class, truly wish to help your regions and where there are people who try to make use of you. And you must not be simpletons in these matters.

[Unidentified speaker from the floor] Nikalay Ivanovich, may I ask a question?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, please ask.

[Speaker] [Passage indistinct]

[Ryzhkov] There is just one kind of foul play. I understood it like this. If the leadership of the cooperative movement arrives, it should arrive in a region to help the working class, to help. Cooperatives have been created; the cooperative movement has been restored, to improve the market situation, to get goods made, consumer-...[changes thought], to make it possible to buy and bring in vegetables and fruit and so on. That is, here is the raison d'etre for the cooperative movement. But if they arrive and do not say a word about how to help, on the contrary if agitation begins with them saying comrades, you hold on, you press on, and so on, then what is the point of the cooperatives here?

[Shchadov] The main calibre weapons for putting pressure on the government. [Sentence as heard]

[Indistinct calls from the floor]

[Ryzhkov] I think that we have some great short coming where information is concerned. I feel, even today, when comrades speak, I feel that many questions they ask, that they pose, they are either solved or are in the process of being solved. Comrade Shchadov has, I don't know, evidently many magazines, technical magazines of all kinds. Yes?

[Shchadov] Yes.

[Ryzhkov] Do they amount to 10?

[Shchadov] No.

[Ryzhkov] They would? Let us turn out one magazine—well, in the final analysis, not necessarily the main magazine—let us turn out one magazine to provide information, perhaps, every month, so that this magazine might publish perhaps a decision, perhaps an account of how it is being fulfilled, and so on.

And the last thing, comrades. You see that in the process of today's discussion there are very many requests of all different kinds. We will attentively study these requests and will provide help as much as possible. In conclusion, again I would like to tell you something despite the fact that—for me at least—there has been a very complex talk this morning. I don't say difficult; I am used to difficulties. Thus, a complex talk, we did not have a simple talk today, but I think this talk was necessary, necessary, despite all its minuses. Perhaps, somewhere we said something incorrectly, but this talk is necessary. It will enable us to better find out the state of affairs and, the main thing, to plan ways which will improve the situation, as a whole, with regard to the fulfillment of those decisions which we achieved this summer.

I, on behalf of the government, want to express gratitude to you for such a constructive talk; and I hope that we will continue to work harmoniously and deal with common tasks.

[Voice from audience] [words indistinct]

[Ryzhkov] On Semipalatinsk, is that right? On Semipalatinsk tinsk. It is true, I have not answered this question. We did not conduct any blasts for 1 ½ years. We declared a moratorium for half a year, then extended it for another half a year, then again for half a year. As a result, for 1 ½ years we did not carry out any explosions. But when we saw the Americans taking a lead in improving their weapons, we were forced to resume the tests in Semipalatinsk. Our goal in the near future is to reduce the number of explosions and to reduce their yield, in the first place. In the second place, now we have commissioned certain of our comrades, namely Comrade Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers for military-industrial matters, so that during the first quarter all suggestions with regard to Semipalatinsk will finally be considered.

[Voice from audience] We cannot, Nikolay Ivanovich. We are telling the truth. Well, we are speaking the truth; we cannot go back and say to the miners: Well, comrades, there will be a certain number of explosions this year."

[Ryzhkov] There will not be any this year.

[Voice from the audience] In the first quarter of 1990 it will be considered by a special commission.

[Ryzhkov] And a decision will be adopted.

[Voice from audience] A decision will be made. Right. Now let us stop here for the moment. We will write it all down now.

[Ryzhkov] Go ahead.

[Voice from audience] Now the question arises as follows: The decision, of course, will not be made in our favor.

[Ryzhkov] I would want it, I would very much want it to be in your favor. But, one has to take a realistic view of how one is to act. Therefore, I am taking several months in order to sit down and sort things out with the whole military-industrial complex. Let's wait for a few months while all the necessary calculations are carried out by the comrades who are in charge of all these issues.

[Voice from audience] The question of liability of individuals guilty of failing to carry out the decision was raised repeatedly during the speeches. What are we to say to the people who are waiting for an answer to this question?

[Ryzhkov] You tell the people that the Council of Ministers will consider this question especially. I think, I did not talk about this here, but we will gather together the Presidium of the Council of Ministers and we will examine this issue. Well, then, comrades, once again I wish you success.

[Voznesenskiy] The conference ended, but the people did not disperse for a long time. The discussions and arguments continued for a long time. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, after the conference, held a meeting with representatives of the Vorkuta miners. It ended late in the evening. The following telegram was sent to the labor collectives of the Vorkuta-Ugol Association: On 17 November the government of the USSR, jointly with representatives of the labor collectives of the Vorkuta-Ugol Association, examined the questions that were raised, and adopted decisions of principle in connection with them, as is known to the representatives who took part in this meeting. An understanding was reached that these decisions will be drawn up in appropriate documents within a 10-day period. Nikolay Ryzhkov. [video shows typescript of this message]

The country expects a businesslike and practical response from the miners of Vorkuta and the miners of all coal basins. The country must be confident that it will not be left without power and heat in winter.

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Answer Students' Questions

LD1711135689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1846 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Question and answer session with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the All-Union Student Forum in the Moscow Palace of Youth on 15 November; all questions read aloud by Gorbachev and Ryzhkov—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Now esteemed comrades, we present answers given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to the questions asked by the participants in the All-Union Student Forum.

[Gorbachev] I will try, as we go along, as it were, to give brief answers to the questions.

What place does perestroyka occupy in the general process of the development of world civilization? [laughter, followed by applause] In this aspect is perestroyka objective or subjective? You are the initiator of perestroyka. What most of all brought you personally to an understanding of the need for perestroyka: the high level of development in the West or the crisis in our society? (Mikhail Zhigalov) third year student of the Historical Faculty of Lipetsk State University.

A good question. It seems to me that I have already tried to answer it. I think that our perestroyka—I have already had occasion to speak about this—is, all in all, a solid contribution to the progress of our present-day civilization. And if in implementing the socialist ideal we are trying to achieve a new look for our society, which will, above all, be characterized by humanism, democracy, freedom, and the free development of the personality, then it seems to me that this will advance, this will assist, in general, the advancement of world civilization. If one adds to this that in simultaneously reforming our society, giving it our socialist structure, a second wind, as it were, and revealing its potential, we have at the same time proposed, in the framework of the new political thinking, to all peoples, the idea of constructing a new world order and that we proceed through changes, radical changes in international relations, to a period, a protracted period of the peaceful development of humanity. In this connection, we have started from the fact that the last stage, the cold war, showed fully the bankruptcy of the policy of counting on force, of the arms race, and of confrontation. Indeed, in addition, we have also found ourselves now in a situation in which the problem of the survival of civilization and other global challenges, including the ecological, the information, and the scientific and technical revolutions, have become practical issues. All this has been perceived in the world and has aroused a great response and if it was perceived in its first stage almost as utopia, as some sort of messianism—although from the very beginning it was on the basis of an analysis both of the previous development of international relations and an assessment of the situation in which our whole civilization found itself, that we built our entire policy, all our new thinking—now this is perceived as a policy with a long-term future. And yesterday I, in coversation with Mr Dumas, minister of foreign affairs of France...yesterday we were able to note that if 3 or 4 years ago we seemed to stand at the crossroads which way would we go? Along the path to further confrontation, struggle against one other, or would we turn toward more cooperation, the normalization of relations on the basis of the right of each people to choose, to adhere to its own political system, and ideological and other values being recognised. One can nevertheless say that today the world has moved even if it is at the very start, even if the process has only just begun.

There is still a lot of mistrust and suspicion. That still occurs. And there are still a lot of weapons in the world,

but it seems to me that the world has moved in that direction. So, from the point of view of foreign policy also on the basis of the new thinking, I think that perestroyka is an enormous contribution to the development of present-day civilization. That's the first point.

What brought me personally to understand that? Comrades, I think that if we were to reduce everything, well, to the standpoint of some single person, that would add little to our knowledge or to our understanding both of perestroyka and of the past, present, and future. Logic itself and the actual situation in our society led to the need for profound transformations. I've even said that, at first, it seems to us that...[pause] perhaps...[pause] that we needed to improve or perfect something. Today, we have firmly reached the conclusion—and we can all see it—that we need to reform everything fundamentally and to ensure profound changes at the base level, in production relations, in the political process, in the sphere of our spiritual life, and in the sphere of our society's culture. Therefore, I would say that both the whole of society and...[pause] myself as a part of that society...[pause] are ripe for profound changes. Such is the logic of development.

In your speeches, you constantly stress that perestroyka was started by the party, but the people understand clearly that it is an initiative on the part of individual members of the Politburo and Central Committee secretaries. So wouldn't it be a good idea to say so? (Novozhilov), Irkutsk delegation.

Well, I've practically answered that. Even so comrades, I must say that it's unlikely that anyone can claim to attribute to himself the credit for unleashing the processes of perestroyka. Everything that began within the framework of the policy of perestroyka, and what is taking place now are efforts on the part of the Central Committee, the party, and the government, but I must mention the enormous contribution made here by our intelligentsia, and the enormous contribution made by all the social forces in our country. Even so, in order to embark upon fundamental proposals on perestroyka, consultations with all strata in our society is constantly taking place in the Central Committee, in the government, and in the Supreme Soviet. It has simply come to be a good tradition. So there is no point in reducing it to individuals. I think that it's actually a good thing. Nevertheless, it should protect us all the more in the future against mistakes in our approaches to reforming society. And the most important thing is when no answer to the questions that have arisen is forthcoming, in the form of ready-made prescriptions, from above or anywhere else, but is worked out by society itself. In my view, only such a policy is viable and has a future.

What do you think of the unevenness of the pace of the restructuring processes in the various regions of the country? In your opinion, what is the part played in this phenomenon by the local party and Soviet leadership?

Yes, you are right, the person who judges the processes are taking place unevenly. I said...[corrects himself] I touched on the subject when speaking about the fact that, as for the sphere of democracy and glasnost and political processes, it—the politicization of society—is moving more quickly and has all acquired greater dynamism.

Taking this opportunity I would like to ask a question on behalf of Soviet students being trained in the fraternal GDR: there are over 600 of us. We are all informed about the latest political events and reforms taking place in the GDR. In your telegram to U.S. President Bush, referring to the FRG mass media, you expressed the following: that the USSR will support, and supports, the latest decisive steps and reforms in the GDR. Question: what will this support consist of? If it is economic support, will this not affect our economy—after all the FRG is now offering more. What is the USSR's position as regards the issue of the possibility of the unification of the two German states? How, in your view, will this affect, and is this affecting, the overall European climate?

I think that what is taking place in the GDR fits within the framework of renewal, of the process of renewal which has begun in all socialist countries. Well, if one looks at a wider context, the entire world is changing, adapting to the present time, to the present stage of the scientific and technical revolution and to the challenge of global problems. So, the entire world is changing, and the thrust of this change, as we can see, if it prevails, is, nevertheless a positive thrust, toward a better world and cooperation between the peoples. Therefore one can say, whether these changes started late or early, in the final analysis this is up to each people, and each society must mature. We cannot take a course of imposing our perestroyka—we are stressing this all the time—our methods, our approaches toward reforming society. This is unacceptable. Yes, we remain devoted—just as our friends in the socialist countries—to our socialist ideal. Yes, we want to uncover the potential of the socialist system. But this task must be resolved by each country and each people, each party, proceeding from the specific conditions of their country, taking into account the economic level of development, the social and economic situation, traditions, the existing way of life, etc. And this determines both the forms of the changes and the pace of the reforms. And this is very important, comrades. For in the past this is just what was not taken into account, or was not always taken into account, and this has involved great losses. For this reason we welcome what is happening—and what is happening in the GDR.

By the way, at first, during the first days, this looked very dramatic. Today it is assuming such forms as an ongoing large-scale dialogue, ongoing discussions. Well, and the leadership has received support, has received a credit balance of trust for drawing up measures.

Today they have recognized the need to set about solving many questions relating to working out a new course for

renewal. We shall support them on the basis that they're our friends, we have extensive economic contacts with them, which are now—I emphasize now—equal in character, though no doubt the fact that they also receive raw materials from us in the framework of goods exchange makes their operation more reliable. But now no one is giving anything to each other without return and free of charge. Trade and exchange are in progress. And this now embraces many branches of industry. The GDR is our leading trade partner. And we shall cooperate so that at the stage of changes happening in both the Soviet Union and the GDR that cooperation may become more effective; and this will promote the solution of tasks both in the Soviet Union and in the GDR.

Finally, there was some thought here...[pauses] yes: what is the attitude of the USSR to the question of the possible reunification of the two German states? It seems to me that our position is well-known. I have been among those who've spoken on this issue. The fact that two German states exist is the result of the development of history, at certain stages; they are the actual results of world War II, that is, what history decreed. And it is a fact generally acknowledged by the world community. Both these states are members of the United Nations. Along with that, they are also part of international political entities, such as NATO, the Warsaw Pact, CEMA and the European economic market, and so on. In other words, that's the reality. And we must proceed from that reality. What history will decree in the future, remains to be seen. And I don't think that today the question of the reunification of these states is an issue of current politics. And it would simply be—to express an opinion on this subject, with such a subtext—would be interference both in the affairs of the FRG and in the affairs of the people of the GDR. I think that everything—both the European community and the world community—has an interest in stability and in seeing Europe and the world developing in the framework of that stability, and seeing the normal development of the Helsinki process, and attaining new forms of living together. And life will provide the answer—so why try to predict it with tea leaves? And today these are realities that everyone responsible for policy has got to reckon with.

Thus, the fusion of everything, of all creative forces, the unification and consolidation of all the progressive forces of our society, restructuring forces—this is the task of tasks, and of course I, comrades, imagine that students who are also already at the stage, so to speak, when they are assimilating this or that profession or knowledge and are forming their intellectual potential can and must make a great contribution, both from the point of view of the development of the processes of political reform, participating in all these processes, and participating in the discussion of all the issues concerning public life. Students, like all youth, must be involved in everything, and therefore no one can say this is not your business. It is your business. It is your business because already today this is the society in which you live, and, moreover, you are more interested than perhaps, others, that this society should come out into the broad road of free and broad, successful development.

This is not a question but a wish. First of all I wish to assure you that the absolute majority of youth completely supports you and your political course. From all my heart I wish you success. [applause] These are not simply words.

Firstly, please direct the attention of the government to the necessity of solving the most acute student problem—this is the hostel, primarily the family hostel. And secondly, [applause] at the present critical moment of perestroyka bureaucratic impediments, rules, and other regulations in the way of student youth [who want to get] into the party are being preserved. Higher educational establishments are being regulated by the standards of the rayons where they are situated although they comprise the young people and produce the cadres for the whole for the whole republic—(?Almas Chukin), Frunze city, secretary of the KGU [Kirgizskiy Gosudarstvennyy Universitet] Komsomol committee.

Do you recognize the principle of free self-determination for a nation in that form in which it is fixed in the international acts and treaties of the Vienna Declaration? If you do, then why do you come out against this principle in the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh and a number of other issues?

Incidentally, there are here several questions relating to the Karabakh problem and (?concerning) this conflict in general. Here there are also...well, we will be coming to them, we will simply hold them over.

What can I say friends? I think that we are all concerned by the conflict which has arisen around Nagorno-Karabakh. If we say that it arose today, that would not be true. It is an ages-old, chronic conflict, smouldering, sometimes being intensified for certain periods. Now, within the framework of perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost people have raised problems which trouble them. Was the argument of the inhabitants of Nagorno-Karabakh justified by the point of view that certain processes disturbed them in the development of their autonomy? Yes, it was, comrades. And as far as the economic and social, and the satisfaction of cultural requirements are concerned, it was a real one. This is recognized by everyone, including also the leadership of Azerbaijan and the Azerbaijanian people. This is all correct.

Realizing that there are real problems we at the very beginning invited [the sides] to approach the solution of the conflict which had formed in such a manner as to proceed from the fact that these two peoples have lived for centuries and are living and will live next to each other. We are not going to resettle either one or the other people, as was done at one time. No. This is absurd. It is surprising that, when I went into the history of this region, I discovered that there are both eminent representatives of the Azerbaijanian people and eminent

representatives of the Armenian people originating from these lands. There are roots there of two peoples and their culture, and so forth.

In general, these peoples have been there for centuries. And these problems and acute situations have arisen at various times. I think that we should also search for an answer in these terms: that here there cannot be victors. The legitimate rights of the inhabitants of Nagorno-Karabakh, this region, must be respected. There must be real autonomy of this region. All the possibilities for the free development of this people must be ensured. But, clearly, it must be resolved, respecting both Azerbaijan and Armenia. And, in general, I will tell you straight: We must also resolve this proceeding from the fact that this is, basically, also our common pain and distress.

I do not see the possibility of taking the path of such solutions as cutting something off and throwing it away. This, in my opinion, is not acceptable for perestroyka in principle, for we have gone a different way, bringing in the people, opening up the possibilities of discussing all problems, consolidating and working out a common approach, and in this way uniting. Thus here as well, the more so in this delicate sphere. I think—I would not like to go more deeply into this question now—I think, that we should, are all interested, and without fail, together with everyone will find, and will solve this problem. Probably, it will not be resolved straight away. Much resentment has built up. This has brought about many misfortunes. But this is also a lesson, comrades, of how attentive we must be in relation to one another and how important the principle which we have proclaimed on the party platform is—one of the most important principles: People of any nationality in our country, in any little corner, must feel comfortable and be sure of today and tomorrow. We have no alternative.

Sixty million people of various nationalities are living beyond the boundaries of their native territories, territories where their native nation is situated. So can we really take the path of people of one nationality encroaching on those of another? This will doom our perestroyka, and, the main thing, it will not strengthen or make our [Soviet] Union and our world better; on the contrary, it will weaken it.

And so one must speak of this directly. And that's why we have advocated that, in the framework of the federation, without recarving it, but by giving it a new content—democratic, humanistic—and developing the traditions and culture of all the peoples, and showing respect for the very smallest ethnic groups, we should reveal the potential and attain a really genuine harmonization of interethnic relations in the country. I know that in principle you share that approach. And it seems to me that when the government is reproached to the effect that it must be more resolute, more resolute, if that means more resolute from the point of view of preserving and multiplying the potential of friendship and improving relations between our peoples, then we must be fully resolute, and adopt that position publicly, and not adapt ourselves to all sorts of demagogues and separatists who incite and sow interethnic discord.

That's where there must be resoluteness, and not at all so that interethnic problems should be solved by us, you know, by some sort of military means or administrative means. I assure you, comrades, that that won't get us very far: We'll run into an impasse and make these processes still more painful. Therefore, the present leadership is coming in for a lot of comment, both favorable and critical. Well, what of it? That's what a leadership is for. If it's worth anything, it must take everything in, and nevertheless work out a policy that will on the whole correspond to the interests of our peoples and to the future renewal of our country.

Do you share that approach? [applause]

Well, here, in Sumgait, it's all in the context of these events. I will not answer that one.

Comrade Sokh, a student of Adygey Pedagogical Institute, Maykop, asks, it is not an oversimplication to analyze the advent of Stalinism as due merely to the revolutionary impatience of the masses? I think when you read what I said, it doesn't amount to the masses' revolutionary impatience. After all, I was trying to show that what prevailed was not the Leninist concept of socialist transformations, but that in the tough political struggle this particular line got the upper hand, and moreover in that discussion methods were used that were by no means democratic. But I said that the difficulties of that period too, and especially the fact that people really wanted to remake that ruined world from its foundations, in accordance with the way they understood the socialist idea, and indeed the Bolshevik communists themselves who headed the process of revolutionary transformations were also geared to achieving as soon as possible the results of the socialist transformations—of course, that did happen [as heard]. Of course that is a deeper and more complex process. And I think, Comrade Sokh, that that process—why it happened like that—still needs profound—a more profound—investigation. And I welcome the fact that such investigations are now being conducted. I think in the end we'll get a fuller, dialectical picture which will enable us to see and understand that process more deeply. And so the investigation and study of these problems must be continued.

The current opinion is that the solving of many of the students' problems could be undertaken by an all-Union Students' Association. What do you think of the establishment of such an association? Well, I said, think about it and decide for yourselves. But I think students should not confine themselves exclusively to their own problems. Students' problems are part of the problems of our society. [applause]

A withdrawal by students from perestroyka, present-day society and present and future concerns will not give students anything good. They will suddenly discover that

their most golden time has simply been wasted. Therefore, the student movement and the solution of young students' problems must be viewed in the context of perestroyka. I believe that the success of perestroyka will also mean success in solving student problems.

As for what a student organization should be like, you should decide that for yourselves (?all the same), or else you will say: They've imposed it on us from on high again. [applause] So, go and learn how to take responsibility, to take responsibility, for your choice.

How should one understand the recommendation at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the state status of the Russian language throughout the whole territory of the USSR, which is a deviation from the Leninist policy on nationalities? Kuzak, student fraternity at the university, Lvov.

You have not formulated your question precisely, since what is written in the platform is the recognition of a statewide [obshchegosudarstvennyy] status for the Russian language. That is the first thing to be expressed more precisely. Secondly, if you paid attention, nothing of the sort was recorded in the draft platform; but then it appeared in the final version, after discussion of that issue at the plenum. Why? Before the moment of the adoption of the platform, there appeared in society a sentiment among the immense majority of society in favor of the need to reflect in political directives the reality—specifically, that the Russian language is already fulfilling a statewide function today. And we examine it in the dialectic unity when the languages of peoples and nations, the language of the nation which has given its name to a republic is declared the state language in each republic, and where we remain in one federation, we are all in interdependent and have to live, have dealings and tackle problems, and so on—there is nothing I need to tell an enlightened audience about the function, the designation of a language for interethnic dealings in solving tasks facing the whole state. That is how the formula arrived from society, from the discussion—the formula on giving the Russian language [the status] of a statewide language.

But that was not only the result of the discussion. We saw that approaches...other approaches connected with the fact that there is not the due harmony between the situation of the languages of the nations which are declared state languages and, in reality, the role which is fulfilled by the Russian language, with distortions having appeared here on solving these issues, and this set the whole country in motion, comrades. But what is the point of my concealing the situation? I have already said this publicly, and I want to say it now. The Baltic region, you see, has turned out, for all the political culture within which these discussions took place and the processes of perestroyka are in progress and being discussed there—things have ended up there with, in essence, a confrontation occurring in those republics. Moreover, those aren't linguistic problems, because that was followed by a disrespectful attitude and some kind of unequal position, and so on, but we state our principle: Wherever a person lives, he should feel good and confident.

Look—in such a wonderful area, where for decades—what do I mean "decades"?—for centuries Moldavians, Ukrainians, and Russians have lived in Moldavia, but now what sort of passions have broken out there? Over that issue again, comrades. I believe there are 1,500,000 non-Moldavians—Russian-speaking and other nationalities—living there. Moreover, I must be totally frank: We are tackling such fateful issues, comrades, and we have to understand each other.

In the Ukraine, when the issue of languages was discussed and there appeared a point of view—maybe the one which Comrade Kuzak represents, for he has the right to that, to have his own point of view—when, again, there was a clash between the Ukrainian and Russian languages—in general, of course, all the more-...[sentence unfinished].

For instance, I cannot imagine that in our country the Ukrainian language, the language of a large number of people, could either disappear, be supplanted, or be restricted. This is just not acceptable to me, just as with Belorussian—and there were such so to speak phenomena there which alarmed both the people and the intelligentsia. And I think that the tackling of this problem, using the methods of approach by which they are being tackled now, are correct in my view and I welcome this. But at the same time one must bear in mind that, in my opinion according to the data of the latest census, 15 million Russians are living in the Ukraine today.

And when, you understand, they started these arguments which were rather...[changes thought] on the whole, so to speak, I believe agreement and common understanding has been found there—but at the stage of the discussion things took such a turn that, you know, people in the Crimea became so anxious. In the Crimea, you know, Comrade Girenko—I don't know whether he is here or not—he was secretary...[changes thought] That the question in the Crimea was put in such a way that if the matter is being resolved in such a way, we will raise the question of the return of the Crimea to Russia. In the Donbass and Kharkov, you know, they also began to think of raising the question of the return to Russia.

What is this? Is it what we are striving toward. Is this what we need, comrades? Is it precisely such a situation and such processes that we want to provoke in the country? People are living and working together, laboring. What we need to do is to take all the best, everything that has been built and not destroy, but also add, already within the framework of filling the federation with full-blooded life: filling it with everything that is connected with economic and political sovereignty, the free development of languages, nations, culture, etc. That is our path. This path must be followed. And these concerns have also already exerted their influence on the

formulation of tenets and political directives relating to language at the plenum of the party's Central Committee. That is how, Comrade Kuzak, we have arrived at such a political directive, which has been enshrined in the platform.

[Reading new question] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have said very correctly that the problems of unity and students are very much interrelated. To date we are faced with two global problems: the reform of the political system and the reform of the economic system. Question: What is your attitude toward Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, [applause] toward private ownership of the means of production, including toward private institutions of learning? Uspenskiy, the Moscow Communications Institute.

I will start with the last question. As regards my position vis-a-vis private ownership, my position is that of the Communist Manifesto. [applause]

This does not prevent me from being among those who put forward proposals to reform and radically transform production and ownership relations, so as to open up social ownership's potential and attain numerous and various methods of running the economy, methods which would, through leasing, through the cooperative movement, through peasant farms and so on—I will not list the things you are now aware of, things which are under discussion—putting man in charge; owning the means of production, disposing of them and making an effective use of them.

This does not prevent me from remaining firmly with the communist approaches and standpoints in respect of private ownership and deciding in this way to emancipate our economic system by reforming the relationship to ownership. You may say that well, in other countries—including socialist countries—there is small-scale private ownership. First we went and placed...[changes thought] I headed the commission during its final phase on drawing up a draft law on ownership. It contains a great deal that is of very great interest. You read it and you will see. It is a progressive and far-reaching law. Nevertheless this issue was also discussed. Within the framework of the preparation of this law we managed to arrive at a new understanding of individual ownership, giving it a broad interpretation. Great possibilities are opening up there too.

But when we speak of private ownership I do not think that we at the stage of preparing a law on ownership should put forward and enshrine movement toward private ownership almost as a program directive. I do not see this. I have said this to audiences of workers and have said it in Leningrad to workers of the Izhora Works, and am convinced that it is precisely thus. I think that the working class will not support those who want to proceed along the path of making our society capitalist. I know the view and attitude of the workers. I am myself from that milieu and cannot change.

What you want, do yourselves. I shall not retreat from this. I shall not now go into whether it is possible in the future when our economy develops and is reformed and embarks on new forms. This is very broad and deep. Some forms may appear that in one way or another look like and remind one of something like smallscale private ownership. I do not rule out the possibility of this, but let us wait and see. But I would not set this as a program task. I have been arguing this everywhere, and I have told you my position honestly.

As for my attitude to Article 6 of the USSR Constitution—it is one of respect, as it is toward the Constitution as a whole. That is the first thing. [applause] It is our Constitution. By changing our society and having embarked upon a path of profound changes, we are attaining a new understanding and new institutions, new interpretations of the issue of relations of ownership and so forth; I will not list all that. And it must be introduced—well, we have now examined the electoral system and we will have to tackle this—to introduce changes to the Constitution and we will introduce them indeed. I think that when we have really got going and gathered momentum along the path of perestroyka and when our society has really begun to come to grips with new forms of life in all areas, it will become clear to us what sort of Constitution we need as a whole. We will need a new Constitution. This is precisely why the Constitutional Commission has been set up in our country. I am its chairman. We are currently pondering this. For the time being, we shall proceed by, well, tackling the questions posed by life and perestroyka. But there is no doubt that we shall get round to the Constitution. That is why, everything that is posed by life deserves a serious approach and in-depth analysis.

In connection with this surely any article of the Constitution—should the need arise—can be subject to appraisal, examination, changes, transformations, new wording right up to being repealed altogether. In this given instance this applies to Article 6, too.

Everything must be in keeping with a normal constitutional process, as is the customary practice. I am rejecting in this formulation one thing—I do not know whether you have had a chance to hear my speech since, they say, it took place at 02.30 in the morning; I spoke at the end of the sitting—among other things reacting to this part of the debate at the Supreme Soviet.

I am rejecting, comrades, the fact that under the guise of conversations on Article Six, attempts are in fact being made essentially to belittle the prestige of the party, to sow doubts in it, and what is more, thereby, I will put it bluntly, you know, to strike a blow at perestroyka. Today when the processes in society are being made more dynamic, when society has been politicized, when on the basis of both economic and political reform, the processes of decentralization are underway, and consquently they are being accompanied by centrifugal forces, when the processes of giving the republics fuller rights and sovereignty, and of broadening the rights of

autonomous formations and regions are developing, generally all this requires counterbalancing at the same time, so that the organism while it is being aimed at progressive changes did not blow up. Physicists and mathematicians will always therefore support me in this—there is a balance in every organism; minuses and pluses, electrons and protons etc; and all this has been balanced out. It is precisely when something moves from one level to another, then various secretions or absorptions start. We need the party, I cannot see now any other political force which would together with the renewed bodies of the Soviet power gaining strength...[we need] the party which would consolidate society, the party as the political vanguard which would develop a progressive policy and introduce it into society.

Political parties are operating in the whole world. I am sure that the party which has found the courage to state its responsibility for everything that has happened and for that which has not taken place, the party which has been able to subject itself to self-criticism and to open itself for criticism by the whole society, this party deserves respect. This is not just a gathering of noble maidens or a debating club. This is a party, a proper and monolithic one which can endure, a mature party able to turn the whole matter in this way. [applause]

Therefore, one should not formulate the question thus—that is that the question on Article Six is a burning issue, that it is an emergency situation, that one should give up everything and tackle it as soon as possible, or it is the end of the world. This is wrong. This represents a desire to deflect us from our path. This is my reply. Why are you against rejecting [laughter], why are you against rejecting Article Six? I am, addressing this to Nikolay Kataryn from Chelyabinsk oblast. I think Nikolay has heard my reply.

Another question on Article Six. My fellow countrymen from Stavropol wish to obtain a guarantee of my word so as to make me support the idea of creating a single Stavropol university by way of unifying all higher and secondary educational establishments of the kray. They probably want to create a student republic. At one stage in the past it was called Stavropol Soviet Republic. Probably the ideas are still alive. No, please, sort this out yourselves, first. [applause]

[Reading new question] Do you consider it as acceptable to declare the latter day theoreticians, who do not agree with Lenin's interpretation of the Marxist idea of socialism in the epoch of pluralism, to be renegades with well-known consequences of this label? [applause]

I think, comrades, since I have spoken up, what is more, not just spoken up, but, in my view, have done something for the development of the processes of democracy and glasnost which allow us all, the whole society, to discuss all questions openly—I think, my reply to this is contained in this position: Only discussion of ideas, a struggle of ideas, and in the final analysis our search for truth must take us to the right understanding and save us from errors. Therefore, I am in favor of pluralism and for discussion. But naturally I am not for pluralism simply for the sake of pluralism. I am all the same for our socialist idea being enriched in the course of these discussions, it being enriched with the methods and forms of its implementation taking account of the present times in which we live. This, I think is probably where the demarcation line is.

Therefore, I said in general that I am in favor of democracy and glasnost and the criterion of glasnost and democracy is the interests of the people and socialism. Attempts have been made as perestroyka progressed, some say let us leave in place the people's interests but not those of socialism. Perhaps this is to some people's liking, but I insist that the criterion of glasnost, the criterion of democracy is still the interests of the people and socialism.

When will the state, including the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee, undertake the protection of the internal affairs troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and give an official assessment of the MVD troops in the Transcaucasus including in Tbilisi, Uzbekistan, and Moldavia? [laughter and applause]

I think that this is an issue which worries our society even if some people have found grounds for laughter in it. I think it is no laughing matter. We must prove that we can change our society, reform it in accordance with our values without having recourse to force, civil war, or blood-letting but on the basis of democracy, reform of the political process, calm discussion, and having the final decisions taken by the people on all the main issues of the life of our society. In general, we must, as it were, act—even though we have not yet completed this process—as if we were already living in a law-governed state. If we allow that in our transformational process, and you see it in various places, a threat exists, conflicts arise including some with human casualties, if we exclude all methods and leave only political and democratic methods this is already, in itself, a great victory, comrades. I am categorically opposed to solving our problems that have come to a head by strong-arm methods. I do not accept the recommendations and advice that we need dictatorship and that dictatorship will save us, dictatorship in one form or another, and there are all sorts of versions here.

No, we can only be saved by the process that we have started upon, when the people, itself, sees everything, participates in everything and finally influences the final decisions. That means that we must master the democratic process and tackle all questions. On the basis of this, my reply about the role of the MVD troops will be brief. Certainly we are not insured against such things and life shows that one way or another situations arise when it is necessary to provide protection and security both for our perestroyka process and people's lives and then we turn to the functions of the MVD troops and I

consider that what they have done up to now they have done responsibly—for they are Komsomol members [murmuring from hall], young lads, our, so to say, those young people who both today and tomorrow will be living in that society. They have as much interest in it as everyone else. And I think that we should regard their mission in this way, as a rescue mission.

In the meanwhile, it turns out that in fulfilling this very difficult mission which often, as I have already said, leads to the fact that in some region or another deaths are occurring, they are, nonetheless, the ones who take the most blows and the ones who have the most wounded and deaths among the soldiers. There is the factual side of this matter.

Therefore, I think that the whole of society has an interest in supporting them. They are acting responsibly and I am sure that they will continue to act in this way, within the framework of the law, protecting people's security. when The Supreme Soviet discussed this problem it instructed the government to undertake all essential measures—to improve the material position of Internal Affairs officials and to provide material and technical backup and to provide legal protection. All of these matters—some have been resolved, some are still being resolved and they will be resolved by the Supreme Soviet.

As far as events in Tbilisi are concerned—a commission is working on this and it will report to the Supreme Soviet.

The development of democracy in the country and the setting up of a multiparty system. Is this realizable? That is the first question. And the second question: How is one to understand...I do not understand the question. Let us have another try. Perhaps the author of the question will help us a bit later.

The first question: When people talk about a multiparty system, they take as their starting-point the view that interests can only be made known in those conditions—when a multiparty system is in existence. Comrades, I think that there is a certain delusion in this, in my opinion. I'm not ruling out [the possibility] that that's true. But, at the same time, I could now enumerate for you—and the historians or future historians who are present here will simply confirm my thought, my opinion—that despite the fact that 5, 10, or 20 parties exist in many countries, there is absoutely no hint there of any expression or harmonization of these interests. Moreover, even in those conditions, dictatorships and reactionary regimes have quietly flourished—and I say quietly with a certain sarcasm. So the answer is not to be found here.

In what, then, lies the answer? nevertheless, It is in the processes of democratization, in their level, their degree of openness, their extent. Consequently, we have embarked on the road of broad democracy and glasnost, and have opened up the possibility for the exchange of views and the broad discussion of problems in order to bring the interests to light, to take account of them and to harmonize them. Tell us then: Do we need to tackle this? Yes, we do. Is it being tackled? Yes, it is. So this is where the answer is to be sought. If we proceed steadfastly along the road on which we have embarked, then life itself will provide the answer and will remove the anxiety over this issue. One must not take artificial constructions into society.

Right, the second question: How do you see the formation of political youth organizations? [pause] I don't know what that's about.

Is communism realistic, or is it just a Utopian objective? [applause from audience] It seems to me, as a communist...I've spoken on that subject. Let's move toward that communist ideal, renewing socialism through perestroyka and revealing the potential of that society. Let's do everything possible to bring into operation all that is contained in socialism as the first phase of a communist society. We shall then receive a more definite answer to that question. I am sure that the communist ideal, buttressed by Marxist-Leninist teaching and scientific socialism, is an ideal that we hail as the supreme value.

Here's an easy one. My thanks to the people of Odessa. They're inviting me to come to Odessa. [applause] Thank you.

I've already spoken about the creation of a student organization.

The problems of Nagornyy Karabakh, Azerbaijan, and so on. I've touched on that question.

Perhaps in order to amuse us, or perhaps not to amuse—he is, perhaps, reacting to what happened one day in the Supreme Soviet—Comrade Martyrosian asks: Which question do you personally regard as a priority matter—the question of a nation's right to self-determination, or the raising of beer prices? [laughter, brief applause]. Well, I think, nevertheless, that it's a meaningful question. It's a reference and a reaction to the discussions about where to find the resources to cover expenditure on solving urgent social problems. So—as for the first question, I think I've answered it, since perestroyka implies the solution of all questions, including the fundamental transformation of our federation.

It's a good question. It is long, but I will read it out. Now we often speak about the creation of the common European home. It is not a secret that to a large extent we still have to grow to a common European level: In the sphere of human rights, as well as in the sphere of creation and saturation of the national market and in convertibility of the ruble, too. But it's not a lesser problem that we lag behind in the level of training of specialists and that is a guarantee of an increase in the gap in development. What do you think, how can we raise the level of training sharply? Mass training of the specialists abroad? Increase of allocations for science and education under a new structure? Opening the borders for as wide a comparison as possible of the standard of living there and here?—

Aleksandr Vorozhkov, fifth year student at the Kramatorsk Industrial Institute, secretary of the Komsomol Committee.

There are many topics in it, but I would like to answer only the central question, namely, how I understand training of the specialist cadres in order to satisfy the interests of perestroyka, cadres who would be able to master the new methods of work under the conditions of implementation of radical economic reform, cadres who would be able to solve the tasks of the international cooperation. Comrades, above all, I want to congratulate Aleksandr on the fact that by following our compatriot Kozma Prutkov, he sees into the heart of the matter, namely, that the course of perestroyka will not progress without a revolution in thinking and without us creating on the basis of the existing corps of cadres and of the training of new cadres and in the course of training. [as heard] In general, answering your question, Aleksandr, we have arrived at the need of a national program for creating and forming a corps of cadres that answers to perestroyka. All the questions will be there. Of course, first of all, we must do it at home. But it doesn't exclude, but presupposes borrowing experience as well as exchange of experience, and training and study attachments in other countries, etc.

[Reading new question] How would you comment on something that was recently said about the fact that in 1917 in fact a forcible coup by the Bolsheviks took place? And what is happening in the countries of East Europe, including the Soviet Union, now it is the collapse of the totalitarian system of the socialist camp, this is in effect a revolution. Latvian State University, chairman of the Students' Trade Union Committee.

Yes, I think, some people in the West try to pass off the desirable for the real. Every time when these or those problems of the development of socialism and some crisis phenomena occur, including today, when deep changes are taking place—we have embarked on the process of socialist renewal in practically all the countries—they try to interpret it—some, evidently, benefit from presenting it like this—as the collapse of the socialist idea, and a collapse of the choice that we made in October.

But this is also nothing new. No. We are reforming society, taking into account the new realities, revealing the potential of this system as a social system. This is the truth. We shall—I tried to stress this particularly at the first stages so that no one harbored any illusions on this score—proceed along the path of our choice, remaining devoted to socialism.

[Reading new question] Mikhail Sergeyevich, do you believe that the students' forum will be able to radically alter the situation amongst the students?—Comrade Borovikov from Irkutsk oblast. [applause]

I believe that the students' forum is a fine, a great and important event. It will help to alter the situation among the students but this must be done by our common, joint efforts. You and I must find ways and better forms and approaches toward this.

Thank you for being so patient. [applause]

[Ryzhkov] Comrades, a great many questions have come in, including—you noticed a couple of minutes ago a whole package of new questions arriving which, unfortunately, I haven't even had time to read. And, of course, one could systematize certain problems on which I understand you would like to receive an answer, and I will try in some cases to be more specific and in others to link these problems.

The first question is this: It concerns private ownership and my position. In the first place, I would like straightaway to tell you frankly that I do not alter my convictions to suit my audience. You know that I had the opportunity to speak on this question recently in the USSR Supreme Soviet during the debate on the draft law on ownership. I set out my position clearly there, and I would like to reaffirm it here. In the first place, I believe that the question of ownership is not in the economic category, but the political category. It is clearly only from these positions that we should proceed when we discuss the question of whether or not to make private ownership a part of our laws.

Comrades, what do we intend to do next, generally speaking? Why is it that the question of private ownership is such an acute one today? Many people believe that if we proclaim private ownership today the socioeconomic environment and the socioeconomic situation of our people will suddenly change.

I am deeply convinced that this is not the root of the evil. The fact is that over decades, in creating our model of socialism, we have really done things in such a way that state ownership in the country makes up 85 percent, and only 15 percent is other forms of ownership—cooperative ownership, ownership by consumer cooperatives, and public ownership. Therein lies the issue. As for state ownership, the kind of system of economic relations was created in this basic form of ownership which really pushed the working man away from the means of work. That is our entire misfortune. Had we found the kind of economic relations at the time which would have really made it possible to reveal man's potential, in order that he understood that it is his, that it is not some kind of abstraction, this state ownership, but an immense ownership which feeds him and for which he works, the situation which has now come to pass would not then have happened. Thus, do we have other ways to really accomplish this fundamental task of our socioeconomic development? We do. Thus, we consider that we do have other ways in the draft law which is currently being discussed; you know that there was a heated discussion yesterday, or the day before yesterday.

First, it is necessary to sharply reduce the form of state ownership, to reduce it sharply. Whereas today it is 85 percent, in our opinion—these are purely preliminary

calculations, of course, and I do not think that anyone could really give any more solid figures at this stage—we consider that state ownership in its classic concept must clearly amount to up to 30 percent in the country: That is, railways, electric power stations, gas pipelines, and so forth; in other words that ownership which must always be the state's. In all the capitalist countries, which have passed through all their paths of development in an evolutionary manner, it is precisely this ownership that is always held in the hands of the state. As for all the rest, it is necessary to find new forms: The joint-stock company, in which every person can directly be an owner, as they say; cooperative ownership; leasehold relations. In other words, there are a great many forms which make it possible to accomplish this fundamental task. Therein lies the sense, in my opinion, of our further tranformations in the economy as far as the forms of ownership and relations are concerned.

Now: Of course we say that we recognize individual ownership, and we will develop it further. Whereas up until today—take a look at the documents and you will see that when individual forms of ownership, individual ownership are discussed, the discussion has only been about the consumer area, only that. Today, in the new law, we are saying that this ownership must not only be of a consumer nature, it must—it can—also be of a production nature. In other words, a person can buy a goods vehicle, say, and work with it, and so on. In other words, we are in favor of this. The main thing, however, is that the exploitation of man, hired labor, must be fundamentally ruled out. That is, in my opinion, the basis for our further advance in that area. This area in fact gives us an opportunity to solve such problems.

The next question: Market mechanisms in the regulation of economic relations have gien a good account of themselves, why are we trying to think up something new? writes Comrade Puts, Yuriy Alekseyevich, Kharkov Institute.

Well, comrades, to be frank, we have very little experience here. We have the experience of the twenties when there was the NEP [New Economic Policy] and when economic methods of managing the national economy were being tried out. Then all this was lost, and throughout 60-70 years we did not approach this problem, and it was only in the second half of the eighties that we began to study this question. That is why today we are utilizing to the maximum degree everything that is useful in those countries with a market economy. That which is acceptable to our society, that which is acceptable to our economy. Only we must look at things realistically, comrades. For there are many things which, in our view, should be yielding a return today and are finding themselves among a section of our population which is absolutely unprepared, both economically and psychologically. Therefore, we shall have to travel a certain path of this realization; we must work through these processes and that is why we cannot borrow wholesale [the experience of others] because we feel it is unacceptable to us. But there are a lot of things which we borrow, and we shall continue to go on pursuing a policy whereby we can use what we can.

With regard to financial security for the students: Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his speech today that we have been discussing this question in the Politburo and in the government, and we realize that this question must be tackled. The problem now is this, that we must very carefully weigh up all our plans for 1991-95. The problem, according to our enlarged reckoning—we have not studied the question at length as yet—will cost R2,000 - 2,500 million, in order to reach that minimum stipend which is necessary in order to bolster up the financial conditions of our students. I state firmly that from 1991 we must embark on a solution to your problem.

Answer this question: Why should we make it an issue at the forum if the question of the material and social situation of specialists with higher education has not been solved at the level of the Council of Ministers? Let the workers collectives decide whether they need specialists. And so on. [applause] Comrade Kozlov, a student of the Novocherkassk Land-Improvement Engineering Institute, asks the question, Yuriy, I think, I may be wrong. I think he has touched upon a very serious problem.

As far as the sphere of material production is concerned, there has been an improvement, as they say, of late, because the elements of financial autonomy which we are gradually implementing—it is giving workers collectives the opportunity to assess for themselves the contribution of each worker and, accordingly, determine his reward. I would, however, like to voice certain of my particular doubts which have been dictated by the processes now taking place.

We are very much afraid that this economic pressure which exists for enterprises, when financial autonomy is underway, when the collective is begining to divide the money and to apportion it either to wages or the reproduction and so on—that this will ultimately affect our intellectual potential. Why do I say this? Look: We have now transferred science to financial autonomy, and we sensed right away the academic science, the science which works for a period many years in the future, had found itself in a worse material position than those who are engaged in today's matters. In other words, those problems of the moment, assignments of the moment which face a collective, largely do not take account of the future development of, say, scientific and technological progress. Thus, we must find a situation here, too, where the conditions of financial autonomy nevertheless do not tear our specialists away; otherwise a certain number of years will pass and we will find ourselves without our specialists. To find oneself without brains, to put it crudely, is equivalent to stagnation. For this reason it is necessary to watch very carefully in order to prevent the possibility of the number of specialists falling—falling sharply.

[Reading new question] After the earthquake in Armenia it was announced that the regions which had suffered would be revived in 2 years. Is this realistic? If it is, then by what means? If not, what do you think about this? Comrade Artan (?Rashikovich) Zatikyan, a second-year student.

Yes, when the earthquake happened we did in fact, after having assessed the whole situation, outline a program to revive this region, this tragic region, in 2 years. The government adopted all the documents with precisely this calculation in mind. What is the situation today?

We are in fact behind in our progress. I think that we will not keep within the 2 years. We will, of course, perhaps have to add another year for two reasons. The first reason is that we did not count on the construction of installations becoming so much more expensive, a very, very great cost increase in Armenia, because the seismicity changed and the designs changed, and in order to construct one square meter there, as they say, twice as much expenditure is needed as that for constructing in central Russia, and so on.

The second point is the instability which exists in Transcaucasia today. I will tell you that before that blockade we had about 50,000 people working—construction workers building housing, and so on—from other republics, from 13 republics, even from 14 republics. At the time when the blockade of Armenia was carried out, and when whole trains with construction materials were not getting through, some of the people left. Our task is now to restore this. For this reason I think that this tragedy continues to be a tragedy of the whole state and the whole nation, and our task is to nevertheless carry out, as a whole country, that which we promised the Armenian people.

From the delegates of the Kazakh SSR, from the town of Semipalatinsk. When will the question of the testing ground in the region of Semipalatinsk be resolved? This question worries all people from adjacent regions. [applause]

You know, I'll tell you comrades, we would adopt a decision on halting the testing with pleasure today. But let's look at this matter realistically. You know that the Soviet Union announced moratoriums for 18 months, it has extended them and for 18 months it did not carry out a single test. Not a single one. We were waiting for a response. In a patient manner, we were patiently waiting for the United States of America to also agree to halt their testing and with that, as they say, put an end to the perfecting of nuclear weapons for both the Americans and the Soviet Union.

But when 18 months elapsed and the Americans carried out the most huge number of explosions in perfecting their weapons; we were forced to continue. What have we done? Firstly, we have sharply reduced the number of nuclear tests. We have reduced them sharply. Secondly, you are aware of the ceiling which exists in the agreement. This is 150 kilotonnes. Today, we are keeping explosions down to a maximum of not more than 50 per cent—75 kilotonnes. This is what we have done. Therefore we are even now considering the reduction of the number of explosions. Not to carry out 12, say, but considerably less.

But I think that the students should also in the end adopt some kind of decisions, to appeal—say—to the students of the United States of America. In the end we should try to reach an agreement on halting the explosions unilaterally. To stop improving our weapons today could, you understand, result in our finding ourselves in a very complex position. Therefore we are working on this problem, but evidently all our efforts must be applied in this respect.

With regard to the people living in these regions, we have now once again instructed the comrades and we shall set up—yesterday there was a discussion in the Supreme Soviet—we shall also set up a group of specialists, which will once again attentively study all problems of the life of these people there—as regards health-care and so on. We agreed yesterday to return to this question once again in the 1st quarter [of 1990] in order to examine the entire gamut of measures.

[Reads new question] Do you not regard the resumed strikes of the Vorkuta workers as adventurism, including the demands of the miners to preserve northern allowances for young specialists who were born in Vorkuta and who returned after studies to the enterprises of the city?

You remember the summer strike of country's miners. Our attitude was absolutely clear. We said then that, indeed, a great deal of social problems had piled up in this very complex and arduous, I would even say, heroic profession. When, 10 days later, we, as they say, got down to talking, we adopted a certain decision to resolve the socioeconomic problems of the miners of our state. Decision 608 was issued. Miners from all of our country's coal regions took part in it. I have to say that the government and political leadership of the country did everything possible to solve [the strike problem]. In my view, we went a long way to meet the miners, not just because they were on strike, but because they really do have a great many problems. We even reacted with understanding when people expressed—albeit through this extreme means, through the strike—their attitude to problems that had not been solved.

This is one of the decisions which the government monitors the whole time. One of the deputy chairmen of the council of ministers, Comrade Ryabev, systematically monitors it, meets miners and so on. Therefore, of course there are some deviations, particularly with regard to material and technical provision. I could not say unambiguously that it is being fulfilled ideally, but it is being fulfilled. Therefore, my view of the strike which broke out on the 25th and 26th [October] in Vorkuta, I have a negative view of it. I consider that they did not have the moral right to do this. They did not have the

right. Particularly on the threshold of winter when we are entering the most complicated stage. At the same time, once again to put forward some particular demands, I think that this is not an acceptable method.

I think, although five points are drawn up there now but I would like to say that after the 25th we tried to find out in general—tell us, please, what is it that you want in the final analysis? Thirty five points were submitted to us in writing. Then it was doubled. On 2 November there were five points. Of these, take, for example, the first point: Do not disband the strike committees. Well, in the first place, this is not a matter for the government. This is a matter for the supreme state power, a matter for the Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet adopted a decision which determines the whole procedure for settling conflicts, labor conflicts, well, to put it in simple terms, strikes. Therefore, everything is set down there and evidently no one has the right to violate this procedure. In this case it is being violated. Therefore, on the 17th, the day after tomorrow, we are inviting representatives from all the coal regions to the Council of Ministers and we shall devote a whole day to examining the fulfilment of this decision which bears the name Decision no.608.

As far as this particular question on coefficients and so on for those young people who live there, I think that, in the first place we do not have the possibilities today for resolving this. In the second place, we must give very serious thought to the fact that if we adopt a decision for Vorkuta, it is necessary to adopt the decision for the whole Union, because we also have Kamchatka, Magadan, and so on where people live in approximately the same conditions and on the same principles. Therefore, this question must be tackled for the country as a whole.

Here is a very big question. What is the level of inflation in the country? What is the state debt of the USSR? What is the size of the deficit in the state budget to date and what ways are there to get out of this situation? There are increases in prices on consumer goods and low grants—can we really survive at present, and so on. I have already stated my views on grants. I consider that this matter must be tackled.

What is the level of inflation? By the way, this problem causes us, too, much concern and worry. The point is that if I was to tell you that 2 years ago we still had no methodology to define what inflation is, how to measure it and so on—now we have finally come to grips with this and our appropriate department—in this case, the State Committee for Statistics—has elaborated a method for calculating inflation.

If one is to talk of inflation of prices, the thing is that in our economy inflation differs sharply from the inflation in, let us say, the capitalist countries. The point is that we have no market equilibrium now and there are, therefore, money surpluses which fail to be backed up with commodities. This, too, represents inflation of a kind—that is to say the money is there, but, as they say, it is hollow money. So, as far as prices are concerned, this is what our experts' view is: That price inflation this year is on average between about 2 and 2.3 percent. I emphasize the word on average, because I know that certain groups have prices risen more than is the case with other groups.

But, the point is that when we begin to get to the bottom of what is taking place, it turns out that the prices for a proportion of foodstuffs, especailly vegetables and fruit, goes up faster than the average. This particularly goes for foodstuffs, such as potatoes, save for milk and the like, where prices on the whole tend to be stable. Taking into account the fact that people deal precisely with these foodstuffs every day, they of course feel that the figure is higher and the impression is formed that the figure of 2.3 percent is an altogether unrealistic one—it must, in fact, be higher.

So, that is what the situation is like, because some consumers goods, especially consumer durables have stable prices. What is the size of the deficit of state budget? Let me tell you that we entered this year, the year 1989, with the deficit at R120 billion or more than 20 percent of our budget.

This is an altogether impermissible phenomenon. That is why numerous ills which at present occur both at the consumer market and in the sphere of production where, as is being said, there are neither materials, nor construction materials and so forth, stem precisely from the fact that our market is oversaturated with money, say in the sphere of production, wherein the state budget is reflected.

In our estimate, the figure for the new year will be approximately R95 billion. That is to say the measures that have been taken have made it possible to reduce the budget [deficit] somewhat.

We have aired this problem and the Supreme Soviet has lent its support—when the 1990 plan was submitted—to the provision that the budget deficit does not exceed R60 billion. No matter how strange this is but it was, first and foremost, the government that had all the time been insisting that the budget deficit should not be increased more than what was provided for in the plan. This is because until the state budget deficit is not brought down to normal—and it is reckoned that a maximum of between 2 to 3 percent of the GNP is normal—we shall be unable to run our country's economy normally. How many years will be needed to eliminate this impermissible state budget deficit? We have to reply to this question on 12 December this year, when the government presents its considerations to improve the economy during the following 5-year period, during the period that is coming up. We are now working on this problem. Our view—I mean, I do not want to anticipate the future too much—but evidently, apart from the year 1990, very strenuous work will be needed in 1991 and 1992 to bring down the state budget deficit to the figures that are acceptable.

The state debt is the debt of the state to the whole population. It amounts to approximately R400 billion. It's made up of 3 percent loans, the savings that the population deposits, and the loans that are hanging over us from as far back as 1953 and 1955. It all adds up to R400 billion. What's the way out of the situation? I've spoken about that.

[Reads new question] Does our government have a concrete, scientifically based aim for perestroyka? I think that Mikhail Sergeyevich has said a great deal today about political perestroyka. As for economic perestroyka, yes, there is an aim, and we are obliged in the very near future to give a precise report on this to our people. One cannot live without an aim, and we have such an aim.

A question about banks: Do we need a multibank system? I should like to tell you that we very often speak about the experience of foreign countries and so on. In my view, we have very few banks—very few. If we are thinking of returning once more to the monopoly of a single bank, we shan't achieve anything good. We need to have more banks within the country and to work more flexibly, and it is necessary for a bank to be a very major economic category in our economic reform. [applause]

I thank you for your attention and for your endurance. [applause]

Gorbachev Queried on GDR Events

LD1611220189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1846 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Question and answer session with President M.S. Gorbachev at the All-Union Student Forum in the Moscow Palace of Youth on 15 November; questions read aloud by Gorbachev—recorded]

[Excerpt] [video shows Gorbachev reading out question] Taking this opportunity I would like to ask a question on behalf of Soviet students being trained in the fraternal GDR: There are over 600 of us. We are all informed about the latest political events and reforms taking place in the GDR. In your telegram to U.S. President Bush, referring to the FRG mass media, you expressed the following: That the USSR will support, and supports, the latest decisive steps and reforms in the GDR. Question: What will this support consist of? If it is economic support, will this not affect our economy—after all the FRG is now offering more. What is the USSR's position regarding the issue of unification of the two German states? How, in your view, will this affect, and is this affecting, the overall European climate?

I think that what is taking place in the GDR fits within the framework of renewal, of the process of renewal which has begun in all socialist countries. Well, if one looks at a wider context, the entire world is changing, adapting to the present time, to the present stage of the scientific and technical revolution and to the challenge of global problems. So, the entire world is changing, and the thrust of this change, as we can see, if it prevails, is, nevertheless, a positive thrust toward a better world and cooperation between the peoples. Therefore, one can say, whether these changes started late or early, that in the final analysis this is up to each people, and each society must mature. We cannot take a course of imposing our perestroyka—we are stressing this all the time—our methods, our approaches toward reforming society. This is unacceptable. Yes, we remain devoted—just as our friends in the socialist countries—to our socialist ideal. Yes, we want to uncover the potential of the socialist system. But this task must be resolved by each country and each people, each party, proceeding from the specific conditions of their country, taking into account the economic level of development, the social and economic situation, traditions, the existing way of life, etc. And this determines both the forms of the changes and the pace of the reforms. And this is very important, comrades. For in the past this is just what was not taken into account, or was not always taken into account, and this has involved great losses. For this reason we welcome what is happening—and what is happening in the GDR.

By the way, at first, during the first days, this looked very dramatic. Today it is assuming such forms as an ongoing large-scale dialogue, ongoing discussions. Well, and the leadership has received support, has received a credit balance of trust for drawing up measures.

Today they have recognized the need to set about solving many questions relating to working out a new course for renewal. We shall support them on the basis that they're our friends, we have extensive economic contacts with them, which are now—I emphasize now—equal in character, though no doubt the fact that they also receive raw materials from us in the framework of goods exchange makes their operation more reliable. But now no one is giving anything to someone else without return and free of charge. Trade and exchange are in progress. And this now embraces many branches of industry. The GDR is our leading trade partner. And we shall cooperate so that at the stage of changes happening in both the Soviet Union and the GDR that cooperation may become more effective; and this will promote the solution of tasks both in the Soviet Union and in the GDR.

Finally, there was some thought here...[pauses] Yes: What is the attitude of the USSR to the question of the possible reunification of the two German states? It seems to me that our position is well-known. I have been among those who've spoken on this issue. The fact that two German states exist is the result of the development of history, at certain stages; they are the actual results of World War II—that is, what history decreed. And it is a fact generally acknowledged by the world community. Both these states are members of the United Nations. Along with that, they are also part of international political entities, such as NATO, the Warsaw Pact, CEMA and the European economic market, and so on. In other words, that's the reality. And we must proceed from that reality. What history will decree in the future remains to be seen. And I don't think that today the

question of the reunification of these states is an issue of current politics. And it would simply be—to express an opinion on this subject with such a subtext—would be interference both in the affairs of the FRG and in the affairs of the people of the GDR. I think that everyone—both the European Community and the world community—has an interest in stability and in seeing Europe and the world developing in the framework of that stability, and seeing the normal development of the Helsinki process, and attaining new forms of living together. And life will provide the answer. So why try to predict it with tea leaves? And today these are realities that everyone responsible for policy must reckon with.

Ligachev on Students, Current Issues

LD1811105189 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Unscheduled interview with CPSU Politburo member Yegor Ligachev by unidentified correspondent; Ligachev's remarks in Russian fading into superimposed English translation; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Soviet party and government leaders are involved in the national students' forum now under way in Moscow. Politburo member Yegor Ligachev, who is also a secretary of the party's Central Committee, was speaking in an interview with radio Moscow:

[Correspondent] With tensions running high all over the country almost all Politburo members thought it necessary to take part in the students' forum, could you explain why?

[Ligachev] Part of the answer is in your question. Far from being simple, the situation places the need for wider dialogue on the ground now more than ever before. We have entered a crucial stage in which the knowledge of and care for the interests of all classes and groups are of importance. That is what lies behind the Politburo's decision on an active and fruitful dialogue with students. Secondly, students form a specific layer, a sizable part of the younger generation. They are both the nation's future and partly its present. Before long they will take in charge [as heard] of the country's social development and that impels the leadership to know and form the mood of the new blood to come.

[Correspondent] Perhaps even compromise?

[Ligachev] That's right. A healthy compromise unaffecting [as heard] our principles is always welcome.

[Correspondent] Students perhaps form the most radical part of the younger generation and of the society as a whole. Aren't you worried over the extent of their civic involvement and over going into debate with people who are unlikely to mince words?

[Ligachev] Politburo members who travel extensively have to come into debate with all sections, so students are no exception. In fact, we have gained some experience and feel the need for battling it out in various audiences. And to answer your question, I wish the students would be more active and militant.

[Correspondent] Would you be able to face their militant mood?

[Ligachev] Why shouldn't I be? To begin with I myself was a student once. Secondly, some of my family members work at colleges so I get first hand information from them. No, I have no fear of meeting the students. I'm happy in fact and I feel the students would be up to the mark.

[Correspondent] You paid a visit to the German Democratic Republic recently. Could one expect then the present developments in that country? Do you believe that the processes underway in East European countries jeopardize socialism?

[Ligachev] Frankly speaking I don't think that anyone could expect these events to assume such a rapid pace. The current processes in the German Democratic Republic have a familiar ring of our own problems, of which there are many. I believe that the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is capable of handling the situation with active and direct support from both rank and file communists and working people. I feel although the processes are hard and complex but they are needed. [as heard]

[Correspondent] Do they have an effect on our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany?

[Ligachev] My view is that the processes underway in the socialist countries, the German Democratic Republic in particular, affect our relations with all European nations. The question is one of a common European home which I believe must incorporate all states on the continent. I don't hold with the view saying it must incorporate nations minus their national institutions because it is likely to tumble down them. [as heard] Each nation must be allowed to join it with its own social structure, traditions, and customs. Simultaneously there is also a need to developing [as heard] wide ranging contacts in all areas including the economy, politics, culture, science and technology. That would give the common home a solid groundwork.

[Correspondent] Recently you have frequently been the target of criticism and what can be described as a campaign associated with your name was started. What is your attitude toward it?

[Ligachev] I take a positive attitude toward constructive criticism, I mean the questions concerning policymaking, the theory of perestroyka, which are considered by the political bureau, the government, the Supreme Soviet. I believe it is quite correct but at the same time I resolutely reject all that can be described as downright lies and libel.

[Correspondent] What do you mean by lies and libel?

[Ligachev] I mean the attacks over charges of corruption and bribetaking. I am familiar with the sentiments of the people. I have been getting many letters whose authors correctly assess the entire situation and incidentally offer their active support. This enables me to endure with courage all that some people of questionable integrity and political careerists have to say. I am sure that history is the best judge and in the end of people will judge everyone according to his true merit.

[Correspondent] Are there any political differences between you and Mikhail Gorbachev or other members of the Politburo?

[Ligachev] No, there are no differences between us. Claims to the contrary are no more than inventions motivated by mistakes or desire to drive a wedge between members of the leadership. As I have said on many occasions, I joined the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party together with Mikhail Gorbachev. We held the same views then and we hold the same views now. But naturally we may have different points of view on some particular matter. But, in the end, we come to a shared point of view and one decision that we implement. That is a natural process.

[Correspondent] Perestroyka in the USSR is about 5 years old. Do you believe that your views have changed during perestroyka? Perhaps you have tended toward the left or the right wing?

[Ligachev] I would not use these kinds of terms. I believe that we all have acquired new political experience and that we have all politically matured.

[Correspondent] You supervise farming. Have you felt any change for the better in farming since you have begun to supervise it?

[Ligachev] Less than 1 year has passed since then. It is a very short term considering that our country is a very big one and it is especially true of farming. But there is good reason to believe that some positive trends have emerged. We now have a truly up to date agrarian policy. It does not satisfy everyone but our experience suggests that it is the correct reflection of the processes underway in the agrarian sector. We have drawn up the right policy toward farmers.

[Correspondent] Do you support the idea of handing the land over to farmers?

[Ligachev] I would not put it in such terms. I believe that the land must be owned by the people and that it must be the people's property. Those who till the land must use it.

[Correspondent] Can you say now when such a great country as the USSR will be able to feed itself?

[Ligachev] This will take years. It is impossible to resolve that problem quickly and no illusions should be entertained on that score. But I feel certain that the food problem can be eased in the near-term.

[Correspondent] Are you satisfied with the pace of perestroyka?

[Ligachev] I don't think that there are people who are satisfied with the pace of perestroyka now, but at the same time I would call for more caution and discretion. The wisdom of the leadership is revealed not only in decisionmaking but also in weighing the consequences of the decisions made. We mostly now make decisions that will guide us for decades to come and this calls for much responsibility.

Further Reportage on Student Forum

PM191200589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Specific Deeds Today!"]

[Text] "Schemes for Tomorrow, Specific Deeds Today!"—the eight discussion centers of the All-Union Student Forum carried out their work under this motto 17 November. The students' youthful ardor and the maturity and experience of the senior party officials and members of the government who participated in their work contributed to a constructive dialogue. Words must be followed by deeds. And they must be carried out through joint efforts—this was the chief outcome of the 3d day of the forum's work.

The labor activity of students and pupils in nonstudy time—this was the topic of discussion for the All-Union Student Forum delegates who gathered in Moscow's Sergo Ordzhonikidze Institute of Management. Representatives of the country's educational institutions conducted a lively and interested discussion of aspects of their relations with farms during construction and harvest work in the vacations.

While recognizing the need to give rural working people effective assistance, the speakers drew attention to the importance of observing parity principles in relations and spoke of the poorly informed status of student detachments and their ignorance of their rights. It came to light, for example, that many questions of labor remuneration over which the forum participants had broken lances had already been resolved at the USSR Council of Ministers, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], or the State Committee for Labor and Social Questions. But essentially few people know about the documents—and this undoubtedly affects the effectiveness of the help for rural working people.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the discussion. He spoke highly of the student construction detachments and of those who during the busy time of the harvest or other agricultural campaign come to help rural people and help to safeguard the harvest. This great movement is priceless, the CPSU Central Committee secretary emphasized. For, in addition to the purely noble aim, let us say, of improving the peasant's housing

conditions, repairing livestock premises, or assisting in the harvesting of potatoes, vegetables, and fruits, this public movement develops in young people such features of character as collectivism, diligence, and independence and provides an opportunity to see life better and to develop professional skills.

Of course, there are shortcomings here too. We must not close our eyes to them. Particularly where people fail to show concern for the students' daily life and respect for them. But, on the whole, this matter is on the right track.

The CPSU Central Committee March Plenum, Ye.K. Ligachev said, formulated the party's modern agrarian policy. It consists in changing production relations in the countryside, ensuring diverse forms of organizing and encouraging labor and the peasant's technical and social provision, and expanding the initiative and enterprise of those who carry on agriculture, both social and private.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary answered numerous questions relating to the role and place of the party and the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] in perestroyka, the progress of the economic reform, and the results of the agricultural year.

The very list of the draft resolutions under discussion in one of the forum's discussion clubs—"Students and Sociopolitical Problems"—attests that students are not indifferent to what is happening in the country. There are debates on ways to advance the reform of the political system in the country and to achieve real results in the process of renewal and on the role of students in sociopolitical life. In addition to discussing a draft political declaration, there was discussion here today of the statewide language, of the situation in the mass media, and of interethnic relations. A draft resolution on military service was even proposed—on the initiative of a group of forum delegates from the Baltic republics.

Despite the quite rigid regulations laid down for a speech in the debate (5 minutes), many of the participants managed to present quite harmonious models of the correlation between certain points of Marxist-Leninist theory and the present-day ideas of the renewal of Soviet society. Many valuable views were expressed. S. Dombrovskiy, representative of the Moscow Institute of Steel and Alloys, for example, regards as the chief cause of the difficulties that have taken shape in the country the fact that, unlike the reform of the political system, "perestroyka in the economy has virtually not yet begun," and its chief component—the question of ownership—remains the chief brake on the way to improving economic life.

The student forum has gathered representatives from all republics, and it is no coincidence that one of the urgent topics raised in the discussion was an assessment of the consequences that might result from the processes under way in the republics of creating people's fronts and other public formations. A. Akhmamedov, a student from Turkmenia, was quite categorical in his judgments, but nonetheless his proposal was supported by many forum delegates. We ourselves in the republic, he declared, are perfectly well aware who is for perestroyka and who is against it, and we ask that couriers not be sent to us, hastening to share with us their "own experience," particularly Baltic experience.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated together with the students in a discussion of important problems of the country's development. The members of the discussion club—mainly humanities students—naturally addressed to him many questions connected with the perestroyka of the political system, ideological support for perestroyka, the party's leading role at the contemporary stage, and the situation in the mass media. But it should be noted that there turned out to be far more people wishing to have a tete-a-tete chat with one of the party's leaders than there were in the case of a dialogue with students from the rostrum. V. Frolov, for example, a cadet at Riga's Higher Military-Political School and one of the participants in this 20-minute "blitz tournament," made the following comment on his interest in a "private chat": Students yearn for a frank, friendly discussion...

To defend the rights of their members and not engage in distributing benefits cadged from above—these words of Toomas Knil of Vilnius Arts Academy express an idea to which the forum participants who had gathered in Moscow's Oil and Gas Institute for the discussion "Trade Unions in Educational Institutions" returned over and over again. But it is also necessary to instill order in the distribution of benefits, in the opinion of Sergey Nikiforov of Moscow Medical Institute. The forum's draft resolution recommends that the AUCCTU together with trade union central committees and councils resolve the question of leaving the dues in educational institutions' primary trade union organizations entirely at the disposal of students and pupils. It is also planned to give them an annual grant for cultural-educational and sports-fitness work equal to at least the sum of the trade union dues.

Young people realize that state resources are not infinite, and students are ready to work and not wait for their grants to be increased. At the same time, many participants in the discussion pointed out, students' hands and knowledge must be utilized only to the greatest effect. For example, it is, all the same, more appropriate for future drivers to earn a bit extra in their free time in a motor vehicle plant than as a caretaker. In general, it is necessary to pay very close attention to drawing up a program for the preferential development of science in the USSR, including the preferential development of education, Moscow State University student Makeyev believes. It is possible to raise the living standards of a working student, while avoiding grants from the state's pocket, by freeing him from the payment of taxes at that plant. It is also necessary to extend the privileges enjoyed by economically accountable Komsomol subdivisions to enterprises set up by student trade union organizations.

N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who participated in the discussion, supported this idea, saying that, in his view, it is importa ' to use the labor of students to improve their materia position, not to replenish the state budget. In general, those present chose the optimum forum for discussing problems of concern to them: What? How? For whom and when? The search for answers to these questions directs you toward a specific result. Make your suggestions—we are ready to examine them, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said.

Chatting with students, N.N. Slyunkov emphasized that when resolving any problems it is necessary, above all, to be guided by the demands of common sense and logic. Replying to a note about which criterion to choose if we have laws which slow up our progress, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said that it is necessary to do what is sensible and to adopt decisions which benefit the cause. What is illogical and obviously harmful must be discarded.

USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze met with a large group of All-Union Student Forum delegates.

Addressing the students, E.A. Shevardnadze emphasized that mankind is now at a crucial stage in its development. It may be a question of a second rebirth, as a result of which civilization will appear in a new guise distinguished, primarily, by the uniting of all peoples on the basis of values common to all mankind. The success of the policy of perestroyka and its being brought to a logical conclusion will be of key significance for making this breakthrough.

Everything of concern to people on the planet is within the field of vision of diplomacy and is the subject of talks and other international contacts. A view of the world through the prism of the interests of the person, of the individual, is fundamental here to the foreign policy of the new thinking. This is obviously one of the important reasons for the tremendous worldwide growth of trust in our state and its policy.

During a thorough and relaxed conversation with students E.A. Shevardnadze explained a whole number of specific aspects of the Soviet state's foreign policy activity.

The All-Union Student Forum delegates familiarized themselves with the work of subdivisions and public organizations of the USSR Foreign Ministry. Their many questions were answered by USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov and by leaders of the ministry's administrations and departments.

Approximately 10 resolutions aimed at improving the social and domestic position of students and pupils, which have been adopted since 1984, and the work done by government organizations do not fully accord with modern requirements and do not embrace many problems. This is the opinion of A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, which she expressed to All-Union Student Forum delegates. She addressed a session of the discussion center "The Social and Domestic Position of Students" at the Moscow Textile Institute.

Her meeting with young people in precisely this educational institution was particularly pleasant for A.P. Biryukova. She had studied there, and a large part of her life and work has been associated with the textile industry.

One of the chief problems, to which special attention was paid, is the lack of a unified government concept with regard to youth problems. A comprehensive youth policy has not been elaborated to embrace all aspects of young people's lives—ranging from the problems of kindergartens and schools to the quality of teaching, job placement, material status, and others. Questions of job placement for young people, the technical equipment of higher educational institutions [VUZ's], and young people's involvement in the management of society at all levels await their solution. It is necessary to promote young people more boldly, the speaker emphasized.

Specific problems of the social and domestic position of students, particularly the provision of hostels for VUZ's, attracted the meeting participants' great attention.

Speaking about young people's leisure, A.P. Biryukova pointed out that students must be given an opportunity for active spiritual growth and, perhaps, be granted concessions for visits to museums, other cultural establishments, and sports facilities. A sharp debate arose when discussing other possible concessions for students. When considering concessions, the chairman of the Council of Ministers Bureau emphasized, it is necessary to proceed from the context of the overall socioeconomic situation in the country. We live as we work. The priority task now is to improve the position of poor pensioners. Additional funds are needed to increase grants and for concessions, and these have to be found.

It took just seconds to walk from the room where his coat was taken to the entrance to the hall. It took an hour to cover this short distance in the opposite direction. This was how long it took G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, surrounded by young people, to talk with them 17 November on leaving the hall at the end of a meeting with the members of the discussion center "The Komsomol—Paths of Perestroyka."

This purely external dimension clearly showed the mutual interest. The young people valued the opportunity for direct contact with a party leader and to obtain replies to questions of concern to them. The fact that the Central Committee secretary was in no hurry to leave clearly attested to his wish to delve more deeply into their thoughts and sentiments and his desire to help young men and women to understand complex problems.

The kids used the opportunity in a big way, so to speak. Both during the official part of the meeting and in its spontaneous half general political questions of social significance were put. For example: How do you rate perestroyka within the CPSU? Or: Which fundamental points in the CPSU Statutes and Program should, in your opinion, be changed?

The CPSU Central Committee secretary answered all the questions in detail. In particular, he said that the party has been resolutely renewing itself since April 1985. It is getting away from dogmatic views of itself as a commanding force [komandnaya sila], ridding its work of formalism, and turning it toward the realities of life, starting with primary organizations. Renewal also consists in asserting democratic principles in internal party relations, democratizing cadre work, restructuring the functions of the party apparatus, reducing it, orienting it, above all, toward political activity, and going over to broad glasnost in the work of party committees at all levels. However, the pace of change in society requires more active and consistent work on restructuring the party. This is the chief concern during the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

As for changes to the Statutes, the task is posed not of changing them but of creating new Statutes reflecting the spirit of our revolutionary times. It is necessary to enshrine in them the democratic practice of recent years and to correct the list that now exists toward centralization and detailed regimentation. Substantial innovations are now being formulated on a democratic basis with regard to forming the CPSU's composition, enhancing the political role and independence of primary party organizations, the status of various party structure, extending the rights of union republic communist parties, and a number of others that are no less important. But to compile a new document on such a scale as the CPSU Program it is also necessary to accumulate theoretical knowledge and practical experience. Today it is a question of elaborating the party's political platform over the next few years.

In the discussion of the progress of the political reform and of various aspects of the relationship between party committees and organs of soviet power it was pointed out that the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet sessions graphically demonstrate the real acquisition of power by the soviets. It is important to ensure the legal and economic potential of the soviets locally. The party and the CPSU Central Committee are doing everything to make this process more dynamic. It seems that the real levers of people's power will be strengthened with the adoption of the Law on Local Economy and Self-Management. But the soviets' responsibility must increase too.

Mention was also made of cooperation between the party and the Komsomol and of the fact that their relations must be imbued with Leninist spirit and be based on trust, comradeship, respect for the Komsomol's organizational independence, and active cooperation in resolving the tasks of society's renewal. The bottom line is a very profound spiritual link and unity on the party's ideological platform, which proceed from Lenin and his behests.

Various topics were touched on in the conversation. And you could not help thinking: How immeasurably the intellectual potential and the social experience of our young people have grown over recent years! And how useful such meetings are to them.

But now the few meters of the way back have been covered. It is time to drive away. It was noted in the exchange of opinions on that meeting that the bulk of the questions from this young audience had concerned the party. A very important, very positive aspect, Georgiy Petrovich retorted. This means that young people hold dear the ideals of perestroyka and the goals and tasks set by the party, and they want to take an active part in the processes of perestroyka. You can feel that they are simultaneously seeking effective forms, methods, and means of their involvement.

At the discussion center based in the Moscow Engineering and Construction Institute questions connected with the perestroyka of higher and secondary education and the organization of the teaching process were discussed. They included this one: "The Student and the Military Department." So it was no coincidence that Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, participated in the work of this discussion center. Addressing the gathering, he said, in particular:

"We military people are frequently asked how perestroyka is proceeding in the Armed Forces and how the processes of democratization and glasnost are developing in them. I will say that these processes in the Army and Navy are along the same lines as the renewal of Soviet society, in close connection with the resolution of the problems which the party and the people are tackling today in all spheres—political, economic, spiritual. And can it be otherwise? For our Army is part of the people and lives the same life as they do."

A unilateral systematic reduction of troops and arms is taking place today—by 500,000 men, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 guns, and 820 combat aircraft. We have already withdrawn three tank divisions from the territories of our Warsaw Pact allies and disbanded them. At the same time strike aircraft units, ground-attack and river-crossing assault and other subunits, and a large quantity of armament and hardware have been withdrawn from the groups of forces. The divisions still remaining on the allies' territory are being reformed in a defensive spirit. Reductions are also taking place in the east. One tank division and three air defense brigades have been withdrawn from Mongolia. An air division, an air regiment, and certain other units and subunits have been disbanded. A number of combined-arms large units have been transformed into machinegun and artillery units.

In accordance with a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, more than 173,000 students have been discharged from the Armed Forces. The sum total of personnel discharged from active military service within the framework of the reduction by half a million today stands at over 260,000 men. Approximately 70,000 of the almost 100,000 officers subject to reduction have already been discharged. In 1990 our spending on defense will amount to R70.9 billion—8.2 percent less than last year.

This is the organizational aspect. The training of the Armed Forces is also being transformed in a defensive spirit, and combat regulations and other governing documents are being reworked. The process of the democratization of military life is acquiring increasingly visible features.

D.T. Yazov devoted great attention to a package of questions connected with military training in VUZ's, which are of particular interest to a student audience. He emphasized that military service was and still is the honorable constitutional duty of every USSR citizen. Within the framework of preparing to fulfill it worthily and to resolve the tasks of defending the socialist homeland it is very important for students too to study military matters. There are many problems, sometimes quite acute problems, in the organization of such study today. Naturally, it is not always possible to make the wishes of each specific student agree with the actual possibilities and requirements of organizing the country's adequate and reliable defense. The Ministry of Defense is resolving these problems in conjunction with the USSR State Committee for Public Education, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and other departments and establishments. At the same time constructive suggestions from student youth are being studied and taken into account.

The entire life and activity of the Soviet Armed Forces today is subordinate to the task of preventing war, ensuring peaceful conditions for our society's revolutionary transformation and for the Soviet people's creative labor, and strengthening security and peace on earth.

Then Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, answered numerous students' questions and participated in a discussion of the final documents.

On the same day the leaders of a number of ministries, departments, and party, soviet, and public organizations and people's deputies participated in the work of the discussion centers "The Participation of Students and Pupils in the Management of Educational Institutions" and "The Student Movement."

Gorbachev Attends RSFSR Meeting

LD1811172289 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—Senior party and government officials of autonomous republics, territories and regions of the Russian Federation [RSFSR] met at the CPSU Central Committee today to discuss the activity of party and government organisations in preparing and holding elections to the republican and local bodies of power in the Russian Federation.

The meeting was opened by Mikhail Gorbachev.

It was stressed that the forthcoming elections to republican and local bodies of power are an important part of the second stage of political reform. Further development of perestroyka in Soviet society will largely depend on their results.

Speakers raised a wide range of issues concerning organisational and political work of party organisations, interaction with various mass organsiations and movements. Attention was paid to creating conditions ensuring broad glasnost and openness as well as strict observance of election laws in the runup to the election.

It was stressed at the meeting that efforts should be stepped up in all areas of perestroyka, transition to the new methods of management accelerated and real practical results attained in the areas which are vital for working people. The comprehensive role of soviets was stressed.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the end of the meeting.

Proceedings Reported

PM1911201989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Report entitled: "Conference at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] Today leading workers of party and soviet bodies from the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], held a conference in the CPSU Central Committee building at which questions on the activity of party and soviet organizations during the period of preparation and holding of elections to the republican and local bodies of power in the RSFSR were discussed.

The conference was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Comrade Manayenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report.

Participating in the exchange of opinions which followed were Seleznov, first secretary of the Kursk CPSU Obkom [oblast party committee; Ilyin, first secretary of the Pskov CPSU Obkom; Shenin, first secretary of Krasnoyarsk CPSU Obkom; Kondratyenko, chairman of the executive committee of the Krasnodar Kray Soviet of

People's Deputies; Podolskiy, first secretary of Tambov CPSU Obkom; Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Yarov, chairman of the executive committee of Leningrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; Syrovatko, chairman of the executive committee of Bryansk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; Grishchenko, first secretary of the Udmurt CPSU Obkom; and Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The conference noted that the upcoming elections to republican and local bodies are an important component of the second stage of political reform. The further course of perestroyka in our society will depend to a large extent on their results. Those who are elected to the soviets will be responsible for the practical implementation of the ideas of self-management and self-financing, regional financial autonomy, and the development of soviets as genuine bodies of people's power. It is for this reason that it is so important to ensure that those promoted to the soviets are the most worthy, convinced fighters for perestroyka and renewal of society, who enjoy the well-deserved respect and confidence of the people, and who are capable of working in a new way under new conditions.

The speakers touched on a wide range of issues concerning organizational and mass political work by party organizations, as well as interaction with different public organizations and movements. Attention was drawn to the creation of conditions for holding all pre-election events in an atmosphere of broad glasnost and openness, while strictly observing the laws on elections.

The important role of primary party organizations in the election campaign was stressed, as was the need for enterprising work by party bodies and all communists, for the use of new methods of such work, and for the realistic consideration of the specific situation in each region.

It was noted at the conference that work needs to be stepped up in all areas of perestroyka, that change to new methods of management must be accelerated, and that real practical results on questions of most concern to workers must be sought. The role of the soviets in all these matters was stressed. Attention was given to the strengthening of discipline and order and to increasing the personal responsibility of functionaries, especially in those sectors connected with providing for the population's vital needs. The need to improve the businesslike interaction between central and local levels was discussed. Also discussed were the tasks for fulfilling this year's plan and the organization of smoother, more productive work in 1990, a year in which a considerable amount will have to be done to improve the economic situation in the country.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev delivered a concluding speech.

Also participating in the conference's work were Comrades Zaykov, Kryuchkov, Ligachev, Medvedev, Slyunkov, Lukyanov, Pugo, Razumovskiy, and Usmanov.

Pugo Interviewed on Party Membership

LD1911222289 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—Fewer members are now being admitted to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but this is nothing to scare the central party bodies, said Boris Pugo, chairman of the party control committee, in an interview with Soviet television on November 19.

The central task is to consolidate the party ranks, he stressed.

Pugo said that 18,000 people had left the party of their own free will last year. And although it is but a tiny fraction of the party's more than 19-million strong membership, each case should be considered individually. Discussing reasons for leaving the party ranks, Pugo said that about one third of the leavers were retired on pension, people who did not feel strong enough any longer to actively be involved in the party work. There are people who left the party as a form of protest. Still others were disappointed in the communist ideas after encounters with injustice.

Pugo noted that the very criteria of what a communist may or may not do, have undergone changes lately. In the period when the power-and-pressure system prevailed, people got used to thinking alike, which was considered the norm.

Now, it must be stated with all firmness, this is of the past and we feel no regret about leaving past things to the past, Pugo noted.

Having stressed the importance of the unity of the party, Pugo noted that the understanding of unity is now different, too. What is needed at present is unity arising on the basis of mutual understanding.

Discussing the social and political processes in the baltic region, Pugo, who was first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee until 1988, stressed that they were causing apprehension.

"It used to be believed that internationalism was genetically inherent in the Soviet man. But it is not so. Indeed, many issues were neglected. It was connected with the criminal national policy of Stalin.

"With the advent of perestroyka, people were given an opportunity to discuss many things. But perestroyka is not to blame for aggravation of inter-ethnic relations.

"Very many unanswered questions have accumulated in republics, and they are now being raised. The process of ethnic rebirth has started. I believe it is the right process."

"Unfortunately," Pugo added, "Along with wholesome phenomena that need support, there have emerged openly extremist nationalistic groups which are raising the question of secession.

"I personally consider their judgements immature and divorced from reality."

AUCCTU Chairman on Unions' Future

LD1711215489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 17 November broadcasts a special edition of the "Pulse of Working Life" program entitled "Strategy and Tactics of the Trade Unions" in which correspondent Yakov Smirnov interviews Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Stepan Alekseyevich Shalayev.

Shalayev says that the AUCCTU Central Committee and the trade union committees at republican, oblast, and lower levels are no longer to exert such strong pressure on trade unions, and that the unions are now acting more independently. "We must emancipate the primary trade union organizations so that they are bold and active defenders of the interests of working people," he said, adding that "in many cases there would have been no strikes if our trade union committees had sat down at a table with the administration in time, discussed these problems, and tried to find a solution to them." Although the miners' problems were not ones which could be solved at a local level, he says, the trade union committees should have approached the ministry and the AUCCTU Central Committee, suggesting that "our entire misfortune" was brought about because the issues were postponed because they seemed difficult to resolve at the time.

Smirnov asks Shalayev about the "crisis of confidence" which he said is currently being widely discussed. Shalayev replies that the trade union organizations should decide for themselves who is to be in charge of them, and that the current report-back and election campaign would determine the nature of the trade unions of tomorrow.

On the subject of alternative organizations—strike committees and so on—Shalayev says that they had appeared because the working class had been forced to "take the initiative in examining and resolving many issues, many of the most vital issues." And these committees "showed themselves to be very, very active, I would say", he says.

Shalayev questions whether these strike committees should exist on a permanent footing: "Is yet another new structure really necessary at the enterprise? In my view, it is not." Shalayev goes on to say that "if the trade union committee which represents and defends the interests of working people is working poorly and not defending the workers' interests, in this case one must not set about creating a new body for the labor collective or public organization, but replace those passive people who head the trade union organization." The election of such replacements should be, done without waiting for the next official election period, he suggests, noting that this has already been done in many cases.

The same applies to the labor collective councils: they should be re-elected, rather than having a parallel body set up alongside them. Shalayev stats that there had been many cases of new elections to the trade union committees being conducted at the strike committees' insistence in the Kuzbass and Donbass regions. This resulted in many new and energetic people taking up posts in the trade union structure.

Shalayev agrees with Smirnov's suggestion that "the trade unions' voice has been weaker than it might have been" at the recent Congress of People's Deputies and Supreme Soviet sessions, but says "we are learning" to be more active in this respect. More deputies who are competent and committed should be elected from the trade unions to the Supreme Soviet and other bodies, concludes Shalayev.

Letter to EEC on Soviet Journalist's Detention

AU1811182589 Paris AFP in English 1654 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 18 (AFP)—Three Soviet human rights militants sent a letter to EEC leaders meeting in Paris Saturday to protest the detention and "mistreatment" of an independent Soviet journalist whose life they say has been endangered. The journalist, Sergei Kuznetsov, has been imprisoned since October 18 for criticizing a KGB official, according to a copy of the letter by Andre Mironov, Valery Senderov and Tamara Gregoriants given to AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

The letter charged that political repression continued in the Soviet Union along with the "persecution of independent journalists". They asserted that Soviet authorities had refused medical aid to Mr. Kuznetsov, who was first arrested earlier this year, when he staged a 31-day hunger strike, and that he had suffered a concussion.

They said human rights activist Andrei Sakharov, now a Soviet deputy, also sent a letter protesting at Mr. Kuznetsov's treatment to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on November 13. A similar complaint was made by the London-based International Press Institute.

Armenian Supreme Soviet To Meet 30 Nov

NC1811095889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The newspaper reports that a decree has been issued by the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium on the holding of the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet and on the concluding session of the 10th extraordinary session.

The decree points out that the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the republic's Supreme Soviet will meet on 30 November 1989 in Yerevan and that the 10th extraordinary session should be concluded (?by that date).

Latvians Mark Independence Day 18 Nov

LD1811211789 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Riga, Latvia, November 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev: Latvia today celebrated the anniversary of its independence for the first time in the postwar period. On November 18, 1918, Latvia's statehood was proclaimed. Latvian President Anatoliy Gorbunov on Friday addressed people of the republic on television. He said that, by proclaiming November 18 a holiday, the Latvian Supreme Soviet wanted not to confront this day with other events of the past, revered by the people, but to enrich and deepen the understanding of our historical roots." [quotation marks as received]

Latvia's statehood became possible only as a result of the October 1917 Revolution, and Soviet Russia was the first country to recognise independence of the Latvian Republic.

Tens of thousands of people from all over Latvia gathered today on the embankment of Daugava River to celebrate the anniversary.

The celebrations were attended by Latvian Communist leader Janis Vagris, President Gorbunov and Prime Minister Vilnis Bresis.

Members of parliament, leaders of the Latvian People's Front, writers and poets addressed the people.

Representatives of all districts and cities of Latvia laid flowers at the Liberty Monument in downtown Riga.

550,000 Said To Demonstrate

LD1911105289 Hamburg DPA in German 1001 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—More than 550,000 people demonstrated yesterday in the Latvian capital riga for the independence of the Soviet Baltic republic. this figure was given by Old Schmidt [not further identified], to DPA by telephone today from Riga. [passage omitted]

Schmidt explained the demonstration by saying, "We wanted to let the world know that Latvia wants its independence." [passage omitted]

More on Celebration

LD1811232289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The anniversary of the proclamation of national independence is being celebrated in Latvia for the first time today.

[Correspondent N. Kasyanova] [video shows Riga rooftops, crowds lining route, mass rally, national flags] Had it not been for the October Revolution, it was stated at the recent session of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, it would have been unlikely for Latvia to have gained state independence at that time. The Latvian Republic was first recognized by Soviet Russia and only then by the Western powers. This date has hitherto been interpreted in a rather tendentious way and has not been marked in red as a holiday on the republican calendars. Yet today it has gathered thousands of people together here in Riga; thousands of people, who appealed not for confrontation but for unity of all the peoples living in Latvia.

The perestroyka underway in the country has opened the way to a new process, unthinkable only recently. The status of a state language has been affirmed in Latvia; the Latvian language has been recognized as that state language. A decision on halting immigration has been adopted. A competent commission is at work which will make fully clear the events of 1939 and of the 1940s. All the national symbols have been restored to the people. Associations and societies of national minorities have been set up; new social movements have sprung up. The government of the republic has adopted a whole series of important laws defining people's lives. [video shows national flags, banners bearing slogans in Latvian and English]

[Kasyanova, interviewing Ya. I. Vasermanis, a candidate of historical sciences,in the street at a rally] How do you, as a historian, assess the situation?

[Vasermanis] At present, I think a great deal of profound reappraisal of values is going on. We are rejecting what we probably once called dogmatic, stagnant, or some other sort of thinking, and are mastering what may be described as the new political thinking. We have become accustomed to this concept in international affairs, but what is happening inside the country is assimilation of a new political thinking about ourselves. That means, for instance, giving priority to universal human values; it means special interest and concern that the people's historical memory should have the same democratic potential to emerge as history has.

Agreement on Latvian Religious Broadcasts

LD1811110689 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Riga November 17 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev:

An agreement in principle on granting Latvia's religious confessions state radio and television air time has been reached at a meeting between confession leaders and secretary of the Republican Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet People's Deputy Ivar Kezbers, held here.

Perestroyka exerted a favourable impact on church activities in Latvia. The rights of German Evangelical Lutheran Church have recently been reinstated. Its first theological seminar is due to open in Riga.

The new developments have entailed a great many problems. Representatives of the Lutheran, Catholic and Orthodox Churches, for instance, requested that their buildings and structures, earlier taken away from them without compensation, be returned as soon as possible. Some of the structures have already been returned to the church.

At the meeting religious leaders expressed their considerations on the draft law on freedom of conscience, alternative military service and other problems.

Ivar Kezbers urged representatives of all religions to pool their efforts to give predominance to human values.

Estonian Parliament Passes Election Bill

LD1711185689 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Tallinn November 17 ETA TASS—The Estonian Supreme Soviet passed a law on elections to the Republic's parliament at a session here today.

The law stipulates that those running for parliament have to be 21 years old and have lived in Estonia for not less than 10 years. No residence requirement has been set for voters.

A consultative committee of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic, made up of the representatives of various mass movements, met one day before the session. It ruled that legislation should preserve the residence requirement. After this and other amendments had been made to the bill, it was submitted for a third reading.

This time debates mostly concerned the provision demanding that a candidate should live or work on the territory of a given election district. If this is not done, its proponents argued, central Tallinn authorities will be able to exert more influence on regions. The provision was passed after this view was supported by the majority.

The bill was then put to the vote and endorsed by 186 votes. Nearly 40 deputies from the "Equal Rights" group, who disagreed with the bill, abstained.

Estonian Public Opinion Poll Results

90UN0249 Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 18 Oct 89 p 4

[Article by Yu. Kiviryakhk: "Maynor Public Opinion Research Center Reports"; originally published in NOORTE HAAL, 11 Oct 89]

[Text] *Maynor has been conducting such polls for more than a year now. The public opinion research center has established a work rhythm, and polls on various topics have become regular.*

Constant attention is given to three basic blocks in the polls on topical problems which are conducted four times a year.

1. How public opinion is changing with respect to various governing bodies and what the degree of satisfaction is with leadership of public life.

2. What the main sore points of our public life are in the public's opinion, that is, problems requiring immediate resolution.

3. How the public supports the various political forces.

In addition, during the course of each study, other topics which are at the center of public discussion at a given moment are also examined.

The last such poll was conducted in late September. It polled 931 people over the age of 18. The sampling was done by random selection from voters' lists throughout Estonia. Among those polled, 62 percent were Estonians, 30 percent were Russians, and 8 percent were other nationalities; 36 percent were under age 35; 33 percent were between the ages of 35 and 50; 17 percent did not have a secondary education; 55 percent had a secondary education; and 27 percent had a higher or incomplete higher education. The poll encompassed all republic-subordinate cities, rayon centers, and in each rayon—one randomly selected rural soviet.

Relations Between the People and Governing Bodies

By the end of the year, we managed to overcome the crisis of confidence between the leadership and the people which became acute in the spring of 1988, and throughout 1989 the degree of satisfaction with the leadership of public life was quite stable. On a 5-point scale, it varied between 3.1 and 3.3 points (in March 1988 it was 2.3). As far as Estonians are concerned, the level of their satisfaction is higher (3.5 in September); for non-Estonians, this indicator has not managed to reach the level of a favorable assessment (it rose from 2.7 in 1988 to 2.9). The reason for this is a change in the sources of dissatisfaction. Whereas in the spring of 1988 they were dissatisfied with the stagnant methods of

leadership, now the cause for dissatisfaction of the non-Estonian population is the renunciation of these methods. For example, the average assessment of satisfaction for non-Estonians who support the Intermovement (ID) is 2.6 points; for non-Estonians who oppose the ID it is 3.3.

Since December we have been monitoring how public opinion assesses the actions of individual governing bodies as being in line with the interests of the people.

The attitude of non-Estonians is much more critical. On the average, one out of every five among those polled believe that the interests of the people are not considered very much; 17 percent believe that the Estonian CP Central Committee operates completely in the interests of the people; 19 percent think this about the Supreme Soviet; and 12 percent think this about the Council of Ministers.

Some 31 percent of the Estonians believe that the activities of the Estonian CP Central Committee are completely in keeping with the interests of the people; 53 think this about the Supreme Soviet; and 50 percent think this about the Council of Ministers. Confidence in the Council of Ministers increased particularly noticeably; back in June it was 20 percent. Apparently, restructuring the work of the Gosplan played a part in this. Confidence in the Supreme Soviet appeared after 16 November of last year. Fluctuations in the work of the Supreme Soviet later on lowered the number of its supporters to 36 percent (June). The 53 percent of the votes gathered in September apparently was the reaction to the passage of the Law on Elections to Local Soviets. As the results of a blitz-poll conducted on the evening of 6 October jointly with sociologists from EKE Ariko showed, Estonians were dissatisfied with the last session; therefore, **another drop in confidence can be expected.**

Sore Points of Public Life

To bring to light the sore points of public life, our questionnaires have an open column in which the people being polled themselves can indicate up to three problems which they believe are the most urgent at the given moment. Phrased in various ways, they are grouped in the following manner: problems of protecting the environment; tension in international relations; migration; welfare of the population; restructuring of the economy (implementation of IME [self-governing Estonia]); gaining political sovereignty.

Politicization of the social awareness of the masses began in Estonia in 1987, and this process has been developing especially rapidly among Estonians. The attracting of public attention to problems of protecting the environment in connection with the threat hanging over Virumaa of mining of phosphorite deposits became the starting point of politicization. In addition to the ecological problem, in the spring of 1988 the problem of ethnic relations took on an urgency. In the Estonian milieu, this problem was associated primarily with the unrestrained migration. Already in the summer of last year, the problem of implementing the IME program became equal to these two problems. In the last two polls, Estonians more rarely point to protecting the environment and ethnic relations; the center of gravity has shifted to the IME and political independence. In the September poll, 50 percent of those polled noted problems of economic development (including 28 percent who tied this directly to the IME); 25 percent noted problems of economic independence. Evidently, they see their resolution as the way out of previously urgent problems (this time, 15 percent noted problems of ecology; 17 percent noted migration; and 18 percent see a need for a republic Citizenship Law).

Whereas the views of Estonians during the year acquired unity and were concentrated on gaining economic and political independence, the assessments of non-Estonians on the sore points differed. Nevertheless, in the last poll, problems of economic development clearly stood out (50 percent of those polled, including 17 percent who associate this with the IME). Next came ethnic relations—21 percent. Only 5 percent of the non-Estonians considered the problem of political independence to be important.

Support of Political Forces

The assessment of the various political forces—according to the data of the Maynor Public Opinion Research Center—is applied in practice. Since the beginning of September, we have been getting calls requesting that the data be updated for June. Today you can become familiar with the data from tables 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1. Support of Political Forces (Estonians)

	Fully Support (percent)				Oppose (percent)			
	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89
Estonian CP	18	19	8	10	6	12	17	16
Estonian Komsomol	1	2	2	2	34	42	39	41
Estonian People's Front (NFE)	80	68	68	73	1	2	1	1
Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments	75	69	53	59	1	1	2	2
Greens	79	83	68	67	0	1	1	1
Intermovement (ID)	2	1	1	1	77	88	95	91
United Council of Labor Collectives (OSTK)	4	3	4	4	68	74	54	55

Table 1. Support of Political Forces (Estonians) (Continued)

	Fully Support (percent)				Oppose (percent)			
	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89
Union of Labor Collectives (STK)	+	28	15	21	+	15	24	22
Estonian National Independence Party (PNNE)	15	18	18	22	16	16	10	9
Christian-Democratic Union	+	36	28	36	+	3	3	2
Agrarian Union	+	+	41	53	+	+	2	1
Union of Women	+	+	37	54	+	+	2	1
Democratic Labor Party	+	+	+	9	+	+	+	2
Citizens' Committees	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	91
Strike Committee	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	91

+ indicates that there was no question on assessing this movement; data on those opposing represent the total on the scale of "do not like very much, do not support" and "totally opposed."

Table 2. Support of Political Forces (non-Estonians)

	Fully Support (percent)				Oppose (percent)			
	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89	Dec 88	Apr 89	Jun 89	Sep 89
Estonian CP	19	16	7	11	11	13	15	8
Estonian Komsomol	7	4	0	3	25	25	18	15
Estonian People's Front (NFE)	21	12	8	15	25	47	35	30
Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments	52	37	34	28	2	20	14	35
Greens	50	50	31	42	3	6	8	5
Intermovement (ID)	14	16	12	13	26	30	32	36
United Council of Labor Collectives (OSTK)	26	30	18	24	17	16	18	17
Union of Labor Collectives (STK)	+	22	15	18	+	16	16	11
Estonian National Independence Party (PNNE)	8	8	4	4	41	57	46	49
Christian-Democratic Union	+	7	7	10	+	18	9	8
Agrarian Union	+	+	9	21	+	+	6	5
Union of Women	+	+	20	27	+	+	5	6
Democratic Labor Party	+	+	+	5	+	+	+	17
Citizens' Committees	+	+	+	8	+	+	+	32
Strike Committee	+	+	+	8	+	+	+	48

+ indicates that there was no question on assessing this movement; data on those opposing represent the total on the scale of "do not like very much, do not support" and "totally opposed."

Table 3. What Party or Movement Did You Vote for in the Elections?

Estonians (percent)				Non-Estonians (percent)			
	Apr	Jun	Sep		Apr	Jun	Sep
1. Estonian People's Front	50	56	54	1. Estonian CP	32	19	28
2. Greens	13	11	8	2. Estonian People's Front	9	11	13
3. PNNE	10	6	7	3. Greens	12	15	12
4. Estonian CP	7	6	6	4. OSTK	18	12	11
5. Citizens' Committees	+	+	4	5. ID	11	12	6
6. Society for Protection of Monuments of the Old Ways	6	4	4	6. STK	6	3	4
7. Agrarian Union	8	3	3	7. Union of Women	+	4	2
8. Union of Women	+	3	2	8. Democratic Labor Party	+	+	1

9. Christian-Democratic Union	2	2	1	9. Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments	0	2	1

The remaining movements drew less than 1 percent of the votes. Overall, 39 percent of the population would have voted for the Estonian People's Front, 14 percent for the Estonian Communist Party [CP]; 9 percent for the Greens; 4 percent each for the OSTK and PNNE; 3 percent each for the Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments and citizens' committees; 2 percent each for the ID, Agrarian Union, and Union of Women; and 1 percent each for the Christian-Democratic Union and the Labor Party.

Table 4. How Would You Like To See Estonia in the Future?

	Estonians (percent)		Non-Estonians (percent)	
	Apr	Sep	Apr	Sep
Estonia should maintain its present status—remain a union republic as part of the USSR as a union state.	2	2	54	37
Estonia should achieve independence as part of the USSR as a union of states (confederation)	39	31	25	47
Estonia should become an independent state not part of the USSR.	56	64	5	9
I cannot say.	3	3	14	7

Among Estonians, the number who supported almost all movements, except the ID and OSTK, of course, increased by several percent. At the same time, no single movement has such broad support as was observed last year (only the number supporting the PNNE is increasing gradually). This signifies that the initial splash of political enthusiasm has passed, and the people have already begun to distinguish the platforms of the pro-Estonian movements as well and have begun to approach their assessment differentially. If, instead of expressing support in general, they had to select one single movement and trust it to defend their interests in parliament, more than half the Estonians would prefer the People's Front. The Greens, the PNNE, and the Estonian CP follow roughly as equals.

Among non-Estonians, the Greens movement, the Society for Protection of Ancient Monuments, and the Union of Women enjoy the greatest support; only **then comes the OSTK.** The small number of supporters of clearly political movements indicates that the non-Estonian population does not have a political organization around which it can rally. Support for the Greens, the Society for Protection of Monuments of the Old Ways, and the women's movement are obviously not filled with political content. Apparently, that is also why 28 percent of the non-Estonians plan to vote for the Estonian Communist Party in the elections as the traditionally ruling party. The People's Front, the Greens, and the OSTK will pick up a roughly equal number of votes. The extremism of the Intermovement is pushing away an increasing number of non-Estonians.

The 6 months of elections are beginning in Estonia. One should agree with T. Kyrda (NOORTE HAAL, 5 October) that the key to success of perestroyka in Estonia is in the increase in the political activeness of the non-Estonian population not supporting the ID and OSTK and in turning it from a passive mass into an ally. It is felt that no platform of any of the pro-Estonian movements fills the bill. The political goals for which the Estonian people are striving are not the same as for the non-Estonian population. Non-Estonians may understand, support, and share them, but they need their own **positive goal** for this increased political activeness (the OSTK and ID are based basically on a negative platform that rejects renewal). It is hard to believe that political separation from the land of their ancestors can become a goal. Granted, support for restructuring the USSR on the principles of a confederation has increased noticeably among non-Estonians.

In today's conditions of differentiation of public opinion, it would be quite unrealistic to try to combine the interests of Estonians and non-Estonians within the framework of one movement, at least as long as neither side has sufficient nationality guarantees. The Estonian CP tried to do this, but the number of its supporters decreased as a result, both among Estonians and non-Estonians, depending on which side's interests were being taken into account at a given moment. The emergence of a new political movement would be logical, one which would honestly and democratically protect the interests of the non-Estonian population in conditions of economic accountability in Estonia.

Economic

Sitaryan Discusses Foreign Economic Challenges

90UI0111A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 22, Nov 89 p 2

[Interview with Stepan Aramaisovich Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission]

[Text] Pages of his biography: Born in 1930, an Armenian. Graduated from Moscow's M.V. Lomonosov State University, his specialty being lecturer in political economy. Doctor of economic sciences and academician. Member of the CPSU. He began his working life as senior economist of the USSR Ministry of Finance

Research Financial Institute, subsequently became director thereof and was deputy USSR finance minister. He was then deputy, and in recent years, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

[Question] Foreign economic activity is in itself a complex business, and doubly difficult under present conditions. How do you see the present state of foreign economic relations? After all, the program with which you will start work in your new field will depend on this.

[Answer] The situation which is taking shape in the foreign economic sphere is sufficiently well known. It was discussed at the congress of people's deputies and in the government's program statement. The situation in this sphere is truly far from simple, critical even, I would say.

How is this expressed? In two words. Foreign trade's contribution to the country's GNP continues to decline. Currency losses connected with the steep fall in the world oil price are not as yet being compensated by an increase in the exports of other commodities. At the same time the overall state of the economy and the consumer market is forcing us into substantial import purchases of many industrial commodities and foodstuffs. As a result the country's foreign debt is growing, and the possibilities of the use of foreign economic relations for the large-scale accomplishment of economic and social tasks are being limited appreciably.

[Question] What, in your opinion, needs to be done for us to emerge from this situation? What, in short, are the main tasks which you have to tackle?

[Answer] I believe it possible to distinguish two pivotal tasks on which the attention of all who are connected with the foreign economic sphere—from enterprises through the government—should be concentrated.

First, a structural reorganization as quickly as possible of exports and imports and the increased foreign economic orientation of our country's development. The inefficiency and vulnerability of the structure of our foreign trade are now being manifested extremely seriously. We have for many years built our exports on fuel and raw material resources. In no other developed country does their share of exports amount to 70 percent, as is the case with us. Whence the vital need for an increase in exports of finished products, primarily machinery and equipment, and an acceleration of the rate of increase in export potential. Maximum use must be made for this of the new opportunities which are afforded by the conversion of the defense sectors. Exports of the fuel and raw material sectors should also be oriented toward an increase in the proportion of processed products.

Further, we need to expand service trade: Embark in a businesslike manner on international tourism, in whose development we are at an unjustifiably low level, involve ourselves in exports of engineering and intellectual services and take a close look at the entire chain of license trade.

"Growing rich" in "petrodollars," we became accustomed in the 1970's to import dependency and corrupted many managers. There must be an end to all this. It is necessary first of all to sharply reduce the purchase on such an unwarranted scale of rolled ferrous metal products and pipes and shortly rid ourselves of these purchases altogether. Another weight hanging on the economy is the inordinate grain purchases. We should, perhaps, have renounced imports thereof altogether by the end of the 5-Year Plan. As far as imports in the mechanical engineering field are concerned, we need to tighten the demands on the quality of the purchases. We need primarily machines for the manufacture of machines, modern and technically advanced, what is more. Finally, our import policy must be precisely oriented toward the public's growing social requirements and contribute to saturation of the consumer market.

Second, it needs to be said plainly that no field of our economic activity has been as overcentralized and monopolized by the apparatus as the sphere of foreign economic activity. Now all state and cooperative enterprises and public organizations without exception have been endowed with the right of independent outlet onto the foreign market. However, the incentives to foreign economic activity have yet to be properly adjusted. For example, the guaranteed nature of the sale of any product on the domestic market does not prompt enterprises to search for foreign markets. Another area of the restructuring of the system of the management of foreign economic activity is the granting of the republics, regions, and local authorities extensive rights.

State control of the foreign economic sphere under these conditions should be exercised primarily by economic methods, with the help of a clearly formulated system of tax, price and license control of these processes. Of course, it is essential that they be given a dependable legal basis. We are, perhaps, one of the few countries, if not the only country, which still does not have currency legislation.

It is also necessary to think through once again the entire set of questions connected with organizational forms of the management of enterprises' foreign economic activity. A chaotic and asystemic approach is observed here.

Extensive movement onto the world market cannot be confined merely to the organization of traditional forms of trade and joint-labor activity. We must actively insert ourselves in the entire diversity of world trade and economic relations.

[Question] Now, as you have said, any enterprise may become an exporter. Where are a sufficient number of skilled personnel for foreign economic business to come from?

[Answer] We are experiencing an acute shortage of personnel of the new type—economically able, competent persons possessing modern knowhow in the field of world trade, finance and prices and capable of skillfully

operating on foreign markets, where there is no shortage nor centrally allocated resources, but real tough competition. The first steps are now being taken to create new training centers. But a systemic and, what is most important, large-scale nature needs to be imparted to this work.

Closely linked to this problem is the organization of the information, commercial and statistical servicing of enterprises' foreign economic activity.

[Question] What do you do with yourself in your free time, at home?

[Answer] I have very little such free time, unfortunately. Nonetheless, I try to spend at least some time with my family, with my son and daughter. I do not want to lag behind cultural life: I try to keep up with musical innovations, literature and art.

There is one more thing I would like to mention: When the least opening in practical business appears, I try to do some scientific and theoretical research.

Specialist Defends Past Foreign Trade Role

90UI0088B Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 28 Oct 89 p 4

[Article by Boris Gorshkov: "Is Foreign Trade at Fault?"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

As a former foreign trade specialist, I was interested in the article "The Grain Lobby, or Who and What Is Behind It" which you published on 22 July of this year.

Defaming everything done in our country in the past is now considered to be the thing to do. As I see it, the interlocutors of the "grain lobby" do not quite understand the "causes and consequences" of the foodstuffs crisis which has emerged.

All our troubles are due to the low standard of organization in animal husbandry and crop farming, mismanagement, and errors in the agricultural policy of the government which have brought about the critical situation in supplying the population with foodstuffs.

We should take into account primarily the moral factor—I mean a decline in employee, state, and labor discipline, the striving of some ministries to dictate their will to any and all units, and do so in the field in which they have no competence.

We should engage in the business of helping to restore agriculture and supplies to the populace rather than in treatises on the fictitious "grain lobby."

I agree that grain imports are the simplest way out; however, this entails the degradation of our own economy and the nonsensical squandering of nonrenewable resources of minerals, water, and timber....

However, I do not agree with the statement that, supposedly, the abrupt increase in prices for oil and refinery products which occurred at one point entailed a decline in the interest in producing farm goods accompanied by a switch to imports in grain procurement, as the participants of the panel have presented it. In reality, the problem arose due to the incorrect policy with regard to agricultural producers ("foodstuffs allotment," commands by incompetent organs, a complete deprivation of kolkhoz [collective farm] members of funds for life derived from the labor invested). The appeals "to catch up with and overtake" could have been carried out had it not been for policy errors and all kinds of rascals at the top.

After all, if we were to be frank, the virgin lands have not proven themselves strategically. The growth of industry "width-wise" (in spite of the struggle for increasing the productivity of labor, and replacement of obsolete technology and processes by new ones) and the extensive route of development in agriculture have brought the country to the borders of stagnation, and our confused leaders saw no other way out except for turning to imports which were camouflaged by all kinds of secrecy. The failures were embellished to a great degree by our military program, our success in space and in missile building. Extensive development remained the prevailing factor anyway.

There is no doubt that our losses were tremendous due to the absence of a worthy party and state leader in the arena; democracy and glasnost proclaimed by Khrushchev remained on paper whereas Brezhnev's rule corrupted everybody and everything throughout.

Candidate of Sciences A. Sizov stated in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA that the Ministry of Foreign Trade performed exceptionally large-scale operations and, from 1972 on, "the flywheel of ministerial interests began to pick up speed." This is absolutely false! Actually, both the assortment and the volumes expanded as much as our physical potential permitted. However, this potential was miniscule. I remember how we pushed through the sales of buckwheat husk to Japan and of salt to Denmark (it was later unloaded from steamships with the use of jackhammers). I remember how small the batches were in which young pedigree cows and calves, mink, and even "ripe" Siberian salmon caviar were purchased.... Weren't the trial sales of small fish for dry-curing to... Iceland an example of "resourcefulness?" However, rather than for a month to a month and a half we "furnished" it for almost a year! We had to resort to the intervention of the ambassador, to his telegram "to the top." Weren't the sales of, say, matches, cartridges, and other "small things" an indicator of initiative in the [Ministry of] Foreign Trade? They "read the riot act" to us every year for the small scale of introducing new goods in exports but the foreign trade had nothing to introduce! I am not referring here to the growing deliveries of oil, gas, coal, wheat, and corn—all of that was "ensured," as a rule, by calling association chiefs "on the

carpet" and subsequently giving them urgent assignments regardless of the trends, prices, or tactics: Do it, or it will be off with your head! Now it turns out that the cadres of foreign trade are at fault, and this is why they have been given the boot.... Now, they level the accusation of "lobbyism" at us! If we were to yield to the currently fashionable practice of referring to the opinions and praise by capitalists, the interlocutors of "the grain lobby" [panel] should recall the notoriety which a major transaction gained in the United States in which the Americans lost a billion dollars! We attempted to fight for every kopeck brought in by exports rather than boast the billions spent on instructions from above!

The article also refers to "changes in some managerial structures of the Ministry of Foreign Trade." If this means giving the boot to the cadres assembled over decades then it is immensely harmful for the state whereas it is being passed off as an incredible achievement. Publications of the type of this discussion in the press are an inexcusable mistake.

Concerning the transaction with (Mooremans) Manufacturing which did not come about I cannot say anything without knowing the ins and outs of it. However, whenever I hear about setting up joint societies (i.e., joint enterprises—editorial note) the story of the "Trojan horse" occurs to me.

Here we are talking frequently about a "law-governed state," but why don't we mention that we have also abolished on the sly Lenin's thesis on the monopoly of foreign trade, on eliminating the exploitation of one man by another, on the state (all-people's) ownership of the land, mineral wealth, waters....

I believe that the time has come to discard the scarecrow of "the command-administrative system." After all, it is not the system that is at issue but the way in which it operates. Do they manage industry in developed countries through "people's assembly" and rallies? They use first of all strict compliance in execution: The manager told you so—you do it. You do not execute it—out you go! You make defective products—you pay! I believe that the authors of the panel discussion ought to remember how Lenin fought for the unity of management in the course of developing democracy.

When we were exporters (I also participated in these legendary deeds) we checked how and what the "farmer" stores and hauls, and the quality of it. There was the All-Union Export Commission in which we dominated, and the results of confirmed proceedings of the commission reached the world market. What the authors of the panel discussion say amounts to shifting the blame.

At present, as I understand it, the "Eksportkhleb" Association is to execute someone else's orders thoughtlessly.

The rebuke that foreign trade employees pay no attention to the issue of producing high-quality wheat is not addressed correctly. In the times past, the All-Union Association "Eksportkhleb" had a powerful laboratory the opinion of which was taken into account by both the foreign companies and the Minzag [Ministry of Grain Products]. What remains is merely a memory, a name! This is despite the existence of the VASKhNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I. Lenin], the Grain Institute, and provincial research institutes which are powerful but resourceless.

The issue of grain supply has to resolved at home, within the country. We are capable of this! But are our hands free? The future belongs not to the notorious "farmer" but to kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] given a correct policy and tactic of "the top."

Thus far, too many incompetent individuals have ruled in the "matters of grain," and they continue to do so. However, as Lenin said, if instead of a bad Ministry of Foreign Trade we multiply bad "mini-ministries of foreign trade" a majority of them will be immediately bought out by capitalists. I wish this idea of Lenin would not come true at present....

I do not understand why pessimistic references to authoritative foreigners should be given in the press—after all, they have to hold positions opposite to ours!

If we are to talk about alternatives to grain imports at present we can refer only to the conviction that the current crop will provide for meeting our needs, that we will be able to immediately "reign in" our mismanagement by ensuring the harvesting, processing, and storage of all the grain sown, and that the attitude toward agriculture on the whole, toward kolkhoz property will change.

The fanciful planning of a "target-oriented reduction" in imports is nothing but idle talk. We need to solve all problems in a complex. There is no other way for us.

I think that the system which existed previously (except for various mistakes and drawbacks) was adequate for the needs of the state and could perform in full all the functions assigned to it provided that the government would ensure state discipline on the part of consumers of imported products and suppliers of exported products. However, something like that has not existed for a long time....

Inauguration of BAM Railway Reported

904H0058A Moscow GUDOK in Russian
7 Nov 89 pp 1-2

[Article by GUDOK correspondent T. Andreyeva, datelined Tynda-Chara-Severomuysk: "BAM: A Celebration Without Fanfare"]

[Text] That was it—the Baykal-Amur Mainline [BAM] was inaugurated. This happened in a quiet and mundane manner, without meetings attended by thousands, without a "hooray." It was just that masters came to the

BAM [Baykal-Amur Main Line] stations and double-track sidings and vigorously got down to business preparing to give the "go-ahead" to through train traffic along the entire BAM.

I visited the last sections commissioned during the time of "power-sharing," when construction employees were still there and railroad personnel still had not taken over everything. However, even then Chief of the OVE [expansion unknown] Station Nina Pyleva felt as a guest in her former office in Chara. She is all "packed up," she is going to Berkakit from where construction workers are pushing north with the steel rails of the AYaM [Amur-Yakut Mainline]. Leaving Chara is somewhat sad for her, but what can one do?

As recently as last year, many people doubted whether hundreds of facilities could be commissioned before the onset of winter. However, the doubts turned out to be unjustified: Everything that was included in the plan of facilities to be commissioned was built. The railway station in Chara which resembles the squat yurt of a Kazakh from the steppes was accepted by the state commission with the grade "excellent" thus giving high praise to the work of skilled craftsmen from the sponsors' SSMP [?Construction and Assembly Train] KazakhBAMstroy. Here is a good one: Out of almost 200 kilometers of tracks prepared for commissioning by the labor collectives of the BAMstroyput one-half qualifies as the zero category.

It would appear that there is cause for pride and joy, but the Chief of the BAMstroyput General Contractor Administration, Viktor Yusupovich Abdurakhmanov, whom I met in Kuanda did not look particularly happy. His face was still showing the signs of sleepless nights, and his eyes had a tired look. We have known each other for a long time. I knew him when he was still a young foreman of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Youth Communist League] youth train in Tynda. He has become a big boss since, but has not lost his sense of humor. Even this time he responded jokingly to my question: Why have they not managed to provide heat insulation for some of the external utility pipes in the settlement.

"Indeed, the King is dressed around here, but the pipes are naked... (Korol [King in Russian] is the name of one of the managers of the BAMtranstekhmontazh Trust which is installing the equipment).

He added in a serious vein:

"The suppliers tripped up our subcontractors as far as the insulation is concerned. Still, we have managed to arrange for insulation, we are supplying it right 'off the car,' and in a couple days the insulation of pipes will be completed."

I had one more question for him. I had been told about what to my mind is an unprecedented case: The chief of the railroad himself tried to convince Abdurakhmanov to put the commissioned facilities on stream ahead of time due to their high preparedness but Abdurakhmanov did not agree. I did not waste this opportunity to find out why.

He said: "So that your colleagues, the journalists, would not later accuse me of having 'dumped' a facility to be commissioned; I am in no hurry to have it commissioned," and suddenly admitted: "You know, it is a pity. As soon as I start thinking that this is my last facility to be commissioned on the BAM it makes me sick. I do not know how I am going to live without getting things commissioned. I may get bored...."

Right there, in Kuanda, I met Chief of the Northern Baykal Division of the railroad Viktor Danilovich Kutuzov. A smile of satisfaction was on his face. He had plenty of reasons to be happy: The division has really struck it rich. The house for engine crews here resembles a luxury hotel with its colored windows and Uzbek frescoes. As far as the school goes, there is nothing like it not only at the BAM but also in Uzbekistan the representatives of which have designed and built it. The school is light, spacious; it has round stairwells, paradise birds on stained glass windows, a swimming pool, and even an inner court with an amphitheater protected from the wind. They say that the head of the local department of people's education, having visited the school still under construction with an inspection, was so delighted that he left his post and became the director of the school.

The station in Kuanda is also fancy. This light building with white pylons sits on high ground as if a temple. It has a travertine finish in ethnic colors, yellow and turqoise. Inside there is the blue dome of the sky, also as if in a temple. Artists will put frescoes in there. The station, residential buildings, and the commercial and social center under construction below form a marvelous architectural group. It was conceived by designers from the Uzbek Research and Scientific Institute of Urban Construction, and construction workers of the SSMP UzBAMstroy translated their concept into life.

The SSMP is headed by a colorful person, Anvar Akhmedaliyevich Rizayev. Seven years ago, he disembarked here with the first party of 80 people. At the time, he was not even 30. In his republic, he was considered to be the youngest chief of a construction train but they had faith in him. Rizayev has been able to create a powerful construction organization in a virgin area and to build the most beautiful station on the BAM. Thus far, he is not planning to leave; his plan includes a commercial center, a day-care center, and residential buildings—the facilities which railroad employees await very much.

I found silence and quiet at the neighboring station of Taksimo instead of the fever and rush work I had expected. A boiler plant supplying heat for the settlement was working; treatment and water intake facilities were running. To be sure, construction workers fell behind in finishing high-rise buildings. However, Abdurakhmanov promised to help by transferring the finishing personnel

released from his section. The hammers were knocking at the station as well: Construction workers from the PMK [Mobile Motorized Equipment Pool] LatBAMstroy were finishing the building. They were doing it very diligently and felt bad because the wrong kind of shingles was delivered. They did not get nice finishing tiles either. This is why the exterior of the station conceived in the Gothic style turned out to be slightly different from what they wanted.

Only God himself and the management of the BAM know what price had to be paid for the last commissioned sections of the main line. Hundreds of people have been dispatched to the supplier plants with the order not to come back without materials and equipment. They have pleaded, begged, and stood on their knees—there has been everything. It has come to drinking valerian root broth and to having heart trouble, but they have had to postpone seeing the doctor until after the commissioning.

The facilities to be commissioned have nonetheless received a full set of equipment which has been adjusted in cooperation with the operations personnel and started up despite the environment of grave shortages of everything possible, rejection and brazen breach of contracts by suppliers, extortion by them, and at times flagrant robbery. This is why on that day Chief Engineer of the general contractor trust Nizhneangarsktransstroy Viktor Georgiyevich Mironov was confident. Tension had also subsided among the members of the operations headquarters headed by him which had coordinated preparations for the commissioning of the section Taksimo-Okusikan.

At yet another evening conference, the discussion proceeded slowly. It got livelier only when the message came that the working commission was scheduled for Monday.

Someone asked: "Can't we have it a couple days later?"

Mironov smiled: "No way. This is like it was during the war: There is no land on the other bank of the Volga...."

However, they were not afraid of the commissions though, to be sure, some things did not go smoothly at installations to be commissioned. Thus, their neighbors in Chara and Kuanda started having problems with the water. In Chara, the water began "to eat" the pipes. They had to put in an additional coat of paint on the inside. In Kuanda, they found out that the water had high iron and methane content. They brought special sand for filtering from as far away as the Volga area. Difficulties with housing also surfaced. After all, construction personnel counted on having apartments allocated for them, say, at the expense of the handicapped and the veterans. However, it turned out that in this case there will not be enough housing for engine crews which are to work on these sections. You go and try to find a solution which all concerned accept under the circumstances.

However, the Severomuyskiy Bypass was the greatest problem troubling the construction and operations personnel until the very last day. This is the short name for the electrified open line 54 km long which crosses the Severomuyskiy Range. It represents a reduced copy of the BAM with its bridges, tunnels, overpasses, rock streams, and underground ice lenses. In a word, it is a difficult route with many treacherous natural traps. They began to build it after it became clear that tunneling crews would not be able to finish a 15-kilometer tunnel through the thick of the Severomuyskiy Range before the deadline. Incidentally, some "wise guy" at "the top" even decided to save money on this tunnel by mothballing it. However, calculations have shown that mothballing would require as much money as finishing the tunnel. It has been spared mothballing; however, the construction of the tunnel is being financed on our favorite principle: A drop at a time here and there. Thus, late this summer the BAMtonnelstroy had to face the fact that the investment quotas allocated for this year had already been spent; what was to be done?

Therefore, the construction workers felt on that day the entire acuteness of the situation which they were to face next given poor financing and deliveries not being made. After all, 1.5 billion rubles in capital investment according to the technical concept still remain unused on the BAM. It would be nice not to drag things out and finish the construction project in a single breath.

However, let us backtrack to the bypass. This is, perhaps, the only segment on the BAM where the earth bed has not managed "to settle" before the commissioning. This is why it will require special attention in the process of operation. After all, the bypass was built under extreme conditions (over there, drifts of snow a meter high sit until June) and within a short period of time. However, personally I would not have the determination to predict accidents on the bypass as the esteemed KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has done. We can just as well make similar predictions concerning any of the sections already commissioned because over there subsidence also happens, and solid-looking buildings crack on occasion. We will see in a year whether the work has been done thoroughly or not. This is what an experienced railroad engineer told me on the bypass, but he did not breathe a word about the need to sit back for this year and haul nothing through the bypass. On the contrary, the railroad must operate! It is easier to identify defects in the process of operation.

The route itself is very beautiful. The steel tracks run through the valleys and steep sides of the mountains which prop up the sky with their peaks. From the top, a moving train seems to be a toy. Bridges and two tunnels appear to be toys as well. Each of them is in a class by itself.

An overpass bending in the shape of a gentle curve and supported by elegant two-level pillars is particularly striking. This is the fruit of the labors of specialists from the 52d Bridge Detachment of the Mostostroy-9 Trust.

Working here called for a good deal of courage on the part of all construction workers. Chief of the 11th Tunnel Detachment Pavel Petrovich Yarimaka described how the cutting-in of the first tunnel was done at 45 degrees below freezing, how they had trouble for a long time with the second tunnel, and yet in June 1986 the team of Gennadiy Kuznetsov set in it the all-union record of high-speed tunneling by mining methods—20.8 meters per month. At the first tunnel, they were not into setting records; it was regular work.

From the inside, it looks like a horseshoe which runs along a tremendous fracture (certainly, it can only be seen on geological maps). This horseshoe did not bring luck to the tunneling crew: Two of their comrades died in a cave-in here. The two tunnels are monuments to them.

I was there when the finishing of tunnels was being completed, and drifter teams were no longer there. They were building subways, one of them in Moscow and one in Alma Ata. Their chief Yarimaka still remained at the bypass where he celebrated his small anniversary—10 years at the BAM on the eve of commissioning the railroad.

At the time, lots of people were at work on the route of the bypass. Bridge crews were completing their work. Electricians were suspending contact wires. Track assemblers brought the track into proper condition. I met there Chief Dispatcher of the ZapBAMstroymekhanizatsiya Trust Vladimir Grigoryevich Yakimenko and Chief of the 142d Motorized Equipment Pool Mikhail Ivanovich Bonar. Both of them are veterans of the construction project. Bonar even built the Khrebtovaya-Ust'-Ilimskaya railway, whereas Yakimenko has worked as a pool chief for 20 years. Incidentally, he was the one to dump the first cubic meters of earth into the track beds of the BAM.

Both of them had not left the bypass in several months. Right before I arrived there, the snow had fallen, and Yakimenko appeared smart on the snow in his white summer sneakers. He laughed:

"I just can't make it home."

How could he or Bonar leave when before their eyes this event was happening: The last cubic meters of earth were laid into the route which they had started.

Over there, one more pleasant meeting was in store for me—with Aleksandr Bondar, the former famous team leader and by now a deputy chief engineer of the Nizhneangarsktransstroy Trust. He was overflowing with joyous excitement. He seemed to have shaken off 5 years or so and sort of returned to the summer of 1984 when he and his team were laying the rails toward the "golden" link. It seems to me that he was happy about being on hand for the last assault on the BAM, the bastion of the Severomuyskiy Range.

In turn, I recalled the "finest hour" of the BAM and how construction workers drank champagne from their helmets having connected the track, how the young Sasha Bondar, the future Hero of Socialist Labor, wept, and how tears glistened in the eyes of other guys. This was a great and touching moment: The railway of shiny steel, their dream and their goal, was at their feet. Someone was reading aloud the verses of the BAM poet Vladimir Guziy:

This is it. The track has been joined,
And the last portal has been laid,
The "golden" zveno link is shining—
This is what you dreamt of for 10 years.
When the band starts thundering away
You will come to understand that we
Have found the best path of our life
Through downpours and dust in good time....

Five years later, I also stood at the location where the last, "golden" link of the BAM was laid. The years and rains have long washed off holiday gilding. I thought that time will likewise wash off the great main line the brands of infamy such as "the longest monument to stagnation" or "the road to nowhere." Rapid passenger trains will speed down these rails, heavy freight trains will travel, and the neighboring Transsiberian Main Line will heave a sigh of relief having transferred some of its burden to the steel shoulders of the BAM. In as little as a decade, they will laugh about the fears and doubts concerning the new railroad.

Minsk Environmentalists Block Quarry Proposal

LD1311141989 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] Minsk November 13 TASS—For the first time, a major industrial department in Soviet Byelorussia was defeated by an environmentalist movement: An expert commission from the republican Academy of Sciences rejected the planned construction of a huge quarry, 30 meters deep and with an area of about 700 hectares, to produce sand and gravel not far from Minsk.

The quarry was to be located in a region that is full of underground waters and river sources. The Minsk highlands form a sort of "water tower". Minsk, other Byelorussian cities and numerous water reservoirs depend on this water supply.

The recently adopted "health" programme, which includes a large ecological section, is expected to put an end to departmental diktats. The programme plans to more than halve the atmospheric discharge of poisonous industrial waste by 2000, to create efficient protective zones around plants and to move hazardous production away from residential areas.

By the beginning of the 21st century, 92 per cent of industry will use a circulating water supply that rules out dumping poisonous waste.

A state programme on the elimination of the Chernobyl accident after-effects includes measures to prevent the spread of radionuclides from those areas so badly affected that residents have to relocate. It will also impose strict control over the quality of agricultural goods.

Norilsk Gas Pipeline Damage Reported

LD1711192689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] The capacities of the Norilsk mining and metallurgical combine have been reduced to a minimum. On the night of 14 November an accident occurred 300 km away from the city on the trunk pipeline linking Norilsk with a deposit in the upper reaches of the Messyakhi River.

The pipeline, built 17 years ago, even after reconstruction was unable to withstand a sharp fall in temperature caused by wind speeds exceeding 10 meters a second. A powerful explosion has taken out of operation almost 40 km of pipeline, and 11 valves. Restoration work is under way. [passage omitted] [video shows damaged pipeline lying on the snow and people trying to weld it]

Scientific

'Cosmos-2049' Launched Into Orbit

LD1811081489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS)—'Cosmos-2049,' the latest artificial earth satellite, was launched in the Soviet Union on Friday by a 'Soyuz' launch vehicle.

The satellite is carrying scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in orbit with the following parametres:

Initial period of revolution—89 minutes; maximum distance from the earth's surface (in apogee)—242 kilometers; minimum distance from the earth's surface (in perigee)—189 kilometers; orbital inclination—64.8 degrees.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting data to earth about the work of the instruments and the scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Details Given for 'Energiya' Rocket Program

LD1611133889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Today is the first anniversary of the launch of the universal space transport system 'Energiya-Buran.' Our correspondent Leonid Lazarevich, who conducted live reports from Baykonur a year ago, has interviewed general designer Yuriy Pavlovich Semenov at the Energiya scientific production association: [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Semenov] I must say that, of course, the success was immense. It enabled us to review our program for the use of 'Buran.' Whereas previously we had planned the second flight as a simple flight with a slight expansion of some operations in orbit, today we have reviewed that part as well, and we are planning to conduct the second flight according to a complex program. This means serious transfers between orbits, with a flight duration of up to 7 days. We have started putting the final touches to an automatic system for approaching and docking with the 'Mir' station, work on an onboard manipulator, the simulation of rescue conditions, the docking-on of the Soyuz craft, and the transfer of a crew from the 'Soyuz' craft to the 'Buran' craft.

[Lazarevich] All in one flight?

[Semenov] Yes, all in one flight. Therefore, of course, it is a very full and complex program. Naturally, it requires a very complex approach. It will need time. Therefore, as we have announced, the next launch will be performed in the first half of 1991 with a more complex program. Today the craft is in the testing area. We shall start electrical tests on it in the first quarter, in order to keep to the agreed schedule.

[Lazarevich] But will the testers have to wait in the meantime? I can remember that they had such expectations and hopes.

[Semenov] We are planning that the next flight after that will be in 1992. It will be a manned flight.

[Lazarevich] What about the second half of the system—I mean 'Energiya.' Nobody in the world possesses such a giant, such a powerful rocket; but there is an impressions that we do not yet have anything to put into orbit apart from 'Buran.'

[Semenov] We submitted an initiative at the end of last year. That initiative was supported. Today we are developing a standardized space platform and a booster unit for 'Energiya.' That whole range of equipment will enable us to have a mass of up to 18 tonnes in geostationary orbit.

[Lazarevich] There are small satellites operating in orbit now. Will the platform be more favorable?

[Semenov] It is a qualitatively new leap in providing the country with a telephone network, the creation of a [word indistinct] television system in the information

sphere. It is a qualitatively new leap, quite apart from the fact that it wil be a diverse, special complex. We can also resolve here the issue of resources which we will require for some 10 years. As a whole, it is a very economical system, meaning that it will not require tens of hundreds of launches of small satellites, which are also very expensive in the final analysis. For this it will be necessary to have around four platforms to solve the problems which we have today in providing a telephone network and a television network. [end recording]

Cosmonauts Continue Research Aboard 'Mir'

LD1711212389 Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent from the mission control centre:

Cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov will conduct a series of geophysical experiments aboard the Mir space station on Friday to study the atmosphere.

The research will be conducted with the help of an electronic photometer that measures the brightness of stars as they set over the earth's horizon.

In the afternoon, the cosmonauts are scheduled to conduct the "resonance" experiment to determine the scope and character of micro accelerations in the movement of the space complex and guage its dynamic characteristics.

The crewmen will continue astrophysical research under the roentgen international programme.

On Satuday, orbital telescopes will focus on a roentgen pulsar in the acquarius constellation.

In the past two days, the cosmonauts have conducted technnical and astrophysical experiments and maintenance of the life-support system. The space stations orbit was corrected with the help of power plants of the cargo ship.

The flight is proceeding normally. Both cosmonauts are healthy and feel well.

US-USSR Space Launch Agreement Described

LD1611233389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] As the news agencies have stated today, the first agreement in history about the launch of U.S. satellites using Soviet rockets has been concluded between the Space Commerce Corporation and USSR Glavkosmos. Here is our commentary:

[Sergey Slipchenko] Here is the report. In accordance with a contract worth $54 million, Soviet carrier rockets are to take into near-earth orbit up to eight satellites belonging to the company Energetic Satellite Corporation. It plans to create a satellite system to regulate freight movement over the whole world. The first launch should take place at the end of next year from the Baykonur Cosmodrome. According to the words of (Art Dula), president of Space Commerce, who announced the deal, his corporation in the immediate future will apply for an export licence. I draw your attention to this report because it contains a small factual inaccuracy.

I first met (Art Dula) this summer in June at the air show at Le Bourget where he represented the Soviet space section of the air show—the Soviet section, because (Art Dula) had by then already been working with Glavkosmos for approximately 2 and ½ years; and his activity was, to put it mildly, not very serious, not very commercial. He dealt in special souvenirs, badges, symbolism and printed brochures. (Art) and I talked a lot. [passage omitted]

Today, on the eve of the meeting of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush, there is exceptional interest in the Soviet Union among business circles in the United States of America. [passage omitted]

So this is how things work out. On the one hand, it is contantly said in the West that they emphasize and want to help our restructuring, including the economy. And, on the other hand, when mutually advantageous business deals have already been signed, then the existing law in the United States prohibits seeing them through to the end. Precisely such science-intensive, mutually advantageous contracts, specifically things which are rooted in scientific- technical progress, also may be a subject for discussion between the heads of the two states. Well then, the deals have been signed. Let us see how they will be carried out.

Safety Chief Cited on AES Shutdowns

PM1511103189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with V. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Safety in Industry and Atomic Power Industry, by IZVESTIYA Editorial Office: "Nuclear Atomic Power Stations (AES's): Occurrences in October; USSR State Committee for Safety in Industry and Atomic Power Industry Reports on Work of AES's"; first five paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] In October 1989 there were 45 power units in operation. There were 4 unplanned reductions of yield and 11 unplanned shutdowns of power units, including:

[In the following table column a lists shutdowns caused through the fault of personnel, column b lists shutdowns caused through the fault of design organizations, and column c shutdowns caused because of equipment failure]

	Stoppages	a	b	c
Smolensk AES	2	-	1	1
Chernobyl AES	2	1	1	-
Rovno AES	2	2	-	-
Balakovo AES	1	-	-	1
Bilibino AES	1	-	-	1
Zaporozhye AES	1	-	1	-
Novovoronezhskiy AES	1	1	-	-
South Ukrainian AES	1	1	-	-
IN ALL	11	5	3	3

The conditions for the safe operation of a power unit were violated at the Leningrad AES 10 and 11 October 1989 because of the violation of the work procedure of the accident localization system.

The radiation situation at the AES's and in the monitored zones as a whole does not exceed the limits established for normal operation. There were no cases of personnel being exposed to radiation.

V. Sidorenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Safety in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry [Gospromatomnadzor], answers the IZVESTIYA editorial office's questions.

[IZVESTIYA] Viktor Alekseyevich, first of all comment on what actually happened at the Leningrad AES?

[Sidorenko] On the days indicated in the summary one of the important safety systems ensuring the restriction of the consequences of possible accidents at the unit was twice (for different reasons) not in a state of working readiness. Although there were no adverse consequences our inspection assessed these instances as a gross violation of the operation regulations. The appropriate organizational measures were taken. The design organizations were instructed to elaborate the necessary technical solutions to prevent such instances.

[IZVESTIYA] Indeed, the security of AES's largely depends on the quality of the design according to which the station is erected. How do you assess the standard of Soviet nuclear power technology at existing AES's? Compare it with foreign counterparts.

[Sidorenko] Naturally, it is predetermined by the overall level of Soviet equipment. Where we lag greatly behind, this lag is also inevitably manifested in atomic power engineering. This applies primarily to the level and means of automation and the use of computer equipment and the improvement and reliability of electronic equipment.... In addition to technical devices and systems such as shut-off and control valves, ventilation systems, and, unfortunately, many others. Even if we can assert that the main equipment at a nuclear power installation has specifications which correspond to the world standard, as a whole throughout the station a lower technical and economic level takes shape even at the design stage (we shall leave aside the quality of execution for the time being). The fact that a Soviet nuclear installation already makes it possible to create an AES of a different standard is confirmed by the experience of developing and operating the AES created with our country's help in Finland, which has given a good account of itself as one of the best in the world.

I shall single out two further problems. Our designs, alas, lag behind the standard of the designs of leading foreign countries in terms of the depth of experimental substantiation for the decisions which are taken, in terms of design technology (the very limited use of computer-aided design), and in terms of the quality of presentation of design documents. The obsolete normative base for construction norms and rules is also impeding matters. The nuclear power engineering experimental and research base has now become obsolete and does not provide backup for the tasks which life is setting the sector.

Another problem is that it is very important to ensure in practice a policy for the technical renewal and retooling of the sector. In nuclear power engineering this task is being resolved very badly. Practice shows that so far in our country, given existing economic and technical links, it is easier to close an establishment than to make the necessary improvements at it....

[IZVESTIYA] What role in that case is played by your committee in improving the quality of AES designs? IZVESTIYA readers are interested primarily in ensuring the safety of the station which is being designed.

[Sidorenko] The first avenue of our activity is monitoring the elaboration of the norms and rules which regulate the safety of the nuclear power establishments which are being created. These rules are approved or agreed by the committee. The committee then oversees the observance of the established rules, norms, and instructions by ministries, enterprises, and officials in designing and developing equipment. Here we examine and coordinate (as regards compliance with safety norms and requirements) the technical designs for nuclear reactors and installations and the validity of the choice of sites for constructing nuclear power establishments. And, of course, the designs for their erection. The checking of the quality of the design decisions during start-up and adjustment work and the station's operation is also under the control of USSR Gospromatomnadzor inspectors.

[IZVESTIYA] Who takes part in this work?

[Sidorenko] This process is on many planes. And, understandably, a mass of specialists working both directly in

the committee apparatus and in the inspection groups at AES's and in design organizations take part in it. The staffers of the scientific and technical center under the Gospromatomnadzor also join in. We also enlist consultants from other organizations for expert opinions.

[IZVESTIYA] Are the designs submitted always of high quality?

[Sidorenko] Alas, no. Our demands are tough and, in concerning ourselves ultimately for the high degree of safety of the establishments, we quite often have to return design materials to be worked on further.

Military

Soviet Defense Posture Discussed

AU1411121889 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 13 Nov 89 pp 198-208

[Unattributed article: "We Have Deceived Ourselves"]

[Text] Two dozen paratroop majors are attentively brooding over facsimiles of historical operation plans. The officers, aged 28 to 30, are leading the 30th Motorized Rifle Division once again in its defensive battle against the large-scale German attack at Lake Balaton in Hungary in 1945.

"The last defensive operation of the Soviet troops in World War II," Colonel Anatoliy Malin explains the lessons in war history at Moscow's Frunze Military Academy, the elite school of the Soviet Army, from which almost all important Army leaders of the Soviet Union have graduated.

The traumatic experience of the Great Fatherland War, in which 20 million Soviet citizens died and large parts of the country were devastated, is omnipresent in the Red empire—in the tales of the veterans as well as in the thinking of the soldiers.

The lesson from the defensive battles against Hitler's invasion armies: Never again shall enemy invaders be able to devastate Russia; with superior forces, every attacker is supposed to be destroyed on his own territory; therefore attack alone is a suitable defense.

What has been the indispensable credo of Soviet strategists and the justification of the establishment of a gigantic military apparatus for decades is no longer valid: "Reasonable sufficiency" is the new magic word, with which defense politicians and military men in Moscow are now supporting a purely defensive military doctrine.

The strategic change of direction is only one among a number of dramatic decisions with which Kremlin chief Mikhail Gorbachev is forcing his generals to reassess their military means and possibilities.

—The Soviets give up more than twice as many nuclear weapons as the West in the contractually agreed destruction of all land-based intermediate-range weapons.

—After Eastern superiority has been admitted also in conventional armament, the Soviet Union will put out of service 500,000 soldiers, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 cannons, and 800 combat aircraft within 2 years, without any return measures by the West.

—For 1 and ½ years the military had to refrain from nuclear tests, while the Americans vigorously continued theirs. The Kremlin chief even offered the complete destruction of all nuclear weapons; his foreign minister offered the end of the military alliances in East and West.

—In order to make progress in halving the strategic nuclear arsenals, the Kremlin even toned down the strict "no" of its strategists on Washington's space armament plans. Instead, the government is accusing its own generals of having violated the 1972 ABM treaty with a radar installation near Krasnoyarsk and did so without the knowledge of the politicians.

—The defense budget will be cut drastically; the military loses its right to have access to fields of economy and science which have so far been dominated by the military.

Does the Soviet military, which for decades had privileges and were the only reasonable understandable reason for Moscow's claim to the status of a world power, simply accept being cut back? How do Soviet generals feel about the fact that civilians in parliamentary committees and institutes now want to participate in decisions concerning the armed forces and strategies, about which up to now men in uniform made the decisions practically alone?

"Excessive armament has reached its limits," Lieutenant General Leontiy Kusnetsev, 51, chief of staff in the Moscow Military District, admits. And Colonel General Vladimir Kontshits, 64, commander of the Frunze Academy, knows why: "The military in East and West always demand too much money."

Therefore, "We would say yes to any other reduction," Kontshits promises; however, he misses "reciprocity." Reducing divisions unilaterally is not "the most sensible thing." Kusnetsev also stresses that "this has to happen reciprocally."

The military men do not see any more room for further advance moves. "The Soviet Union and its allies have already covered their part of the path. Now we are waiting for a response from our negotiating partners," Colonel General Bronislav Omelichev, who is the first deputy chief of general staff and responsible for military policy, notes.

The demobilization of 500,000 Soviet soldiers—more than the total strength of the Bundeswehr—which Gorbachev at the UN General Assembly announced would take place before the end of the year, is fully underway:

Two of the 16 military districts, Urals and Central Asia, have simply been abolished, their staffs dissolved, and many units sent home. Their tasks are being taken over by neighboring districts. The command staffs of one army, three army corps, and a dozen air defense staffs have been abolished without any replacement.

So far Moscow has withdrawn three tank divisions, one air force division, two air force regiments, two helicopter groups, as well as more than 10 regiments and troop units with special tasks from the territories of the allies in Eastern Europe and Mongolia. Part of them were disbanded.

From the GDR, the CSSR, Poland, and Hungary alone 28,000 soldiers and 2,700 tanks have been withdrawn. Last week Moscow PRAVDA reported that a total of 235,000 soldiers have been discharged, 7,120 tanks, 2,964 artillery pieces, and 735 aircraft have been taken out of service so far.

"The rest will be eliminated in 1990," Omelichev promises in such a matter-of-course way as if this were a mere trifle. However, Gorbachev's general staff is facing a mammoth task:

By the end of 1990 another 265,000 soldiers, 2,880 tanks, and 5,536 artillery pieces have to be put out of service. In addition, almost 500 tactical nuclear weapons are supposed to have disappeared from Soviet depots in Europe by then: "160 aircraft weapons, 50 artillery missiles, and 284 warheads from missiles," Omelichev says.

Even though the Soviet Navy has already put 40 warships, including 12 submarines, out of service, according to Western estimates, over the next few years it has to scrap far more than 100 ships at shipyards, which have been specially freed from other duties for this.

And if, as planned, at a joint summit of the two military blocs next autumn it is decided to disarm down to equal thresholds between the Atlantic and the Urals, the queues in front of the scrap presses will become enormous. Then the Soviet Union would have to destroy far more than 100,000 armored vehicles and cannons.

For the 5-year plan which ends in 1990, the General Staff calculated savings of R30 billion. Resources are being cut back everywhere—even in the Moscow Military District, the most important one among the "rayons," into which the Kremlin's generals have divided the enormous Soviet domain.

The commanding officers of the Central Defense District all have career positions. Their closeness to the top political and military cadres in the Kremlin, the Central Committee, and the Defense Ministry raises them far above the staff officers of all other districts in the hierarchy of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, the power center of the defense area on Commissariat Lane near the Moskva Embankment reminds one rather of one of the normal apartments of the nomenklatura than of a top military security area. Only one lonely military policeman in a black leather uniform is standing at attention in the middle of the road in the drizzle. No heavy fence or steel door, no barriers for vehicles, not even a simple barrier prevents one from entering the command headquarters.

Under a green hill in the middle of the yard, dug in safe from nuclear bombs, is the nerve center, the war center of the headquarters. This is where, in the event of war, the reserves are mobilized and the rear services of the Moscow region are organized. The military districts form the home front of the Soviet 5-million-man army.

If one believes General Kusnetsev, this front is crumbling: "We have practically no division any more in our military district," the chief of staff complains.

After the elimination of a tank division in Dzerzhinsk near Gorkiy and of a training division and the disbanding of reserve units, only the Taman and the Kantemir divisions are subordinate to the district command. "However, these are parade units," Kusnetsev scoffs, who mainly have to stand their test at parades and during visits by politicians.

"I do not consider this a sensible policy," the general complains. NATO documents contain "fairy-tale figures on our divisions. Small units of 200 to 500 men are counted as divisions," even though not even the equipment of these cadre units is "particularly great."

However, Kusnetsev does not just accuse NATO of using wrong figures: "We have deceived ourselves with our divisions."

The inflation of the Soviet military apparatus, which devoured increasingly larger proportions of the gross national product, the compulsion to show defense forces with as many weapons as possible to the party and the general public, tempted the military to present large Potemkin units: Ancient tanks, long-obsolete weapons and unusable equipment, which rotted away in depots in peacetime and would be manned by badly trained reservists in the event of war, reservists with whom no general would voluntarily go to war, were considered ready for battle.

What is left in the Moscow Military District is shown by two General Staff maps in Kusnetsev's office. On both maps dozens of red flags show the location of units, red circles outline the sphere of action of units.

These maps are not secret, the lieutenant general admits and has the inscription in large cyrillic letters translated: "Map of the dislocation of automobile units during harvest" and "map of the dislocation of road construction brigades."

During harvest the military districts become large agricultural transportation enterprises—a useless help as long as thousands of tonnes of potatoes, cabbage, and grain are rotting at the collection points everywhere in the country because there are problems with transporting them to remoter parts of the country.

And what the military construction work of Soviet pioneers does to the country becomes the everyday nightmare of drivers in all Soviet republics: The road network is almost a nationwide antitank barrier.

It is questionable whether the efficiency of such civilian work can be increased—Kusnetsev's staff, which is responsible for this, has already been reduced by 10 percent. Even more marked are the economic and social problems of disarmament. Many soldiers consider social deficiencies, lack of housing, and other disadvantages of civilian life to be so aggravating that the first Soviet soldiers' trade union was formed at the end of October—with a retired general as honorary chairman.

Newspapers report about a man-the-lifeboats mood among the ground forces in particular. And the wife of an officer even wrote about "victims of disarmament" in a readers' letter.

At least 100,000 professional officers are now supposed to leave service. "Of course, this entails difficulties," retired Major General Yuriy Lebedev, 64, admits.

In the Moscow Military District alone 1,000 officers are to resign this year and next year respectively, 80 percent of them will retire for reasons of age or health. To the remaining fifth the following applies. "Whoever wants to go can go," Chief of Staff Kusnetsev says. However, on this occasion, also those will be discharged "who are not doing their service well." In particular critical officers fear for their jobs.

Frunze chief Kontshits does not see his elite students in danger of being discharged. And those who are discharged have enough work available, the general assures: The economy likes to employ experienced soldiers. "They are snapped up," Kontshits claims, because they have learned "discipline in thinking and acting." Or also special skills—like those specialists who were trained at the computers of the Frunze Academy.

However, top Soviet military technology would have its place in an electronics museum in the West at best: bulky monitors, whose green, flickering signs torture the eyes. Of course, such highly developed electronics cannot be found everywhere in the Soviet Army, Colonel Malin says. In particular the missile forces are equipped with this. The combat units do not yet have anything like this. This sounds like irony.

In particular in this field the enormous lag of the Soviet Union cannot be overlooked. The fear of being hopelessly left behind by the West in the field of high-technology weapons seems certainly well-founded—this is an essential reason for the military's readiness for disarmament.

The technological backlog of the economy is to be reduced by those 168,000 students who have been exempted from military service on orders from above. Therefore, 700 tanks and 900 armored personnel carriers are without qualified crews.

The bloodletting had an even worse effect on the Strategic Missile Forces, to which a particularly high number of well-trained young men are traditionally drafted: The duty crews now have to work for 12 instead of 8 hours so that the command bunkers are ready round the clock for a nuclear counterattack.

However, lack of housing causes the greatest concern. Even though retired officers are permitted to stay in the rooms given to them during their term of service, the many thousands of soldiers who are being recalled from abroad do not even have the mostly squalid service apartments. The same applies to those who do not want to stay in the often remote places where they were discharged.

A Supreme Soviet decree guarantees every former soldier the right to live in his place of birth. But there, like everywhere else in the Soviet Union, accommodation is a scarce commodity. Many of the discharged soldiers end up in the street.

The situation is so critical, retired Major General Lebedev reports ("I myself belong to them and I feel quite comfortable"—he has found a job as "political commentator on military issues" at the government news agency NOVOSTI), that construction projects for civilian industry are being stopped to free financial resources for housing construction. Therefore, the national economy will not be able to draw any profits from disarmament for the time being, Lebedev says, refuting his General Staff. Therefore, scientists from East and West should meet very quickly to investigate how at least the enormous amounts of weapons "can be introduced into the civilian economy" in an economically and ecologically useful way.

The government intends to have about half of the 10,000 tanks which will be taken out of service by the end of next year converted into tractors, bulldozers, and very heavy transportation vehicles. However, suitable factories are already hopelessly overtaxed.

In the entire Moscow Military District there is not one factory for the serial conversion of combat tanks. Chief of Staff Kusnetsev considers the conversion of his scrap tanks, which are now rusting away in depots in the Urals, economically useless anyway.

The enormous consumption of gasoline of these high-powered vehicles cannot be paid for from the budget of a kolkhoz, for instance. Furthermore, the monsters lack the long life which is indispensable for the civilian economy: According to calculations by strategists, a combat tank has to live through two, perhaps three battles, then it is just so much scrap metal—a horror vision for any civilian enterprise.

The military men are personally much more affected by the rapid decline of their reputation. Orphan Kusnetsev, for whom the military replaced his family, suffers because newspapers are increasingly openly criticizing some conditions in the Armed Forces, which are unworthy of human beings—and he considers this criticism exaggerated, even though he does not want to categorically deny harassment of service men.

In reality, harassment is something else: "What the Americans did to their people in Vietnam and what we did with ours in Afghanistan," has a much greater psychological effect on the individual. But "these wars were started by politicians, not by the military."

Academy Commander Kontshits also does not want to know anything about invasions of foreign countries; defense is now the most important thing in the Soviet Army. Most of the training has already been adapted to this.

In the artillery teaching hall a few floors above, 20 future regiment commanders are meanwhile planning the use of division artillery. "In the past, our area for exercise was always Germany," Colonel Malin says standing at the sand table, in which an area near Moscow has been set up.

A major is asked whether the map on which he is just marking barrage fire and positions also represents Soviet territory.

His answer: "No, this is Poland."

Army, Navy Political Directorate Sits

PM1711114589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate: For Purity of Party Ranks"]

[Text] A routine session of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau has heard a report from Lieutenant General Yu. Pankratov, member of the military council and chief of the political directorate of the Carpathian Military District, on the work of the Carpathian Military District political organs and party organizations to strengthen party ranks and renew their composition under the conditions of perestroyka in the Armed Forces.

It was noted that the district political organs are performing work on the further organizational and political consolidation of the party organizations and the strengthening of their role as the political nucleus of the military collectives under the conditions of increased criticism of the party and acuteness in interethnic relations. In the majority of party organizations the democratization of internal party relations, mutual exactingness and self criticism among Communists, and their responsibility are deepening. Studies of topical internal party problems, hearings of party committees and bureaus at full strength, and Communists' reports are being introduced into the practice of political organs.

The political directorate and political organs are stepping up attention toward questions of increasing the authority of party organizations and toward forming in Communists and the entire personnel confidence in the correctness of the revolutionary transformations and measures which the party has outlined and is implementing to maintain the country's defense capability. Exactingness toward the quality of party reinforcements has increased. The monitoring of the candidacy stage and the objectivity of recommendations by the party committees and political organs' party bureaus and commissions has been intensified. The process of purging the CPSU ranks of unworthy people, of whose who discredit the title of Communist and display moral dishonesty, is under way in the district's party organizations.

The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau, in assessing the work which the district political organs and party organizations are doing to consolidate party ranks and renew their composition, noted that there are also serious shortcomings in its organization. They are primarily formalism, the poor standard of the example set by Communists in combat training and military discipline, the inability of many party members and candidate members to be on the sharp edge of the ideological struggle for the masses, the passive attitude of a considerable proportion of party members toward the execution of their duties, and the electoral exactingness of party organs. The education of young Communists is improving only slowly. Such blunders are most greatly inherent in the political organs headed by Colonel V. Borodin and Lieutenant Colonel V. Yefimenko. The bureau indicated the need for the political directorate and political organs to assess these shortcomings in a more principled manner and to eliminate them persistently.

The weakest links, the sitting pointed out, remain the staff party organizations, which concentrate the best-trained military cadres designed to be in the vanguard of the renewal of the military collectives. It is here that party life is to this day within the narrow confines of stagnation, that the processes of democratization and glasnost are not developing, it is here that criticism and self criticism are not held in esteem.

The measures elaborated in the political directorate and political organs to intensify perestroyka in the party organizations' activity seldom touch the deep roots of stagnation phenomena. Many party committees and

bureaus are satisfied with the results achieved and are not seeking ways of overcoming the passivity of a substantial section of their members and of forming in party members unshakable conviction and confidence and the necessary qualities of political fighters. A number of party organizations are failing to pay attention to Communists' education through party assignments and to the raising of the activeness of elected organs and the role of meetings as an important form of the collective elaboration of the program for Communists' joint actions and the implementation of the decisions which have been taken.

The Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate Bureau has demanded that the political directorate take measures to eliminate the shortcomings which have been noted and to ensure the fulfillment of the tasks set in the CPSU Central Committee resolution "on the work of the party organizations to strengthen their ranks and renew the composition of the CPSU under the conditions of the deepening of perestroyka and political reform." The attention of the district's political directorate was drawn to the insufficiently principled assessment of its own activity and the work of the political organs in leading the party organizations and strengthening their ranks and increasing their militancy. In accordance with the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum it has been recommended that each political organ and primary party organization elaborate a program of specific actions to mobilize Communists and the entire personnel to give a fitting greeting to the 28th party congress.

The most important task is to ensure the unity of party ranks on the basis of the improvement of Communists' ideological and political education. It is essential to seek persistently to ensure that the atmosphere in every collective is characterized by genuine party comradeship, a high ideological standard, and mutual exactingness and to constantly seek ways and methods of intensifying the influence on Communists who fulfill their party duties passively and fail to display interest in the life of their party organizations. There was support for the initiative of a number of the district's party organs to carry out the certification of Communists in the party organizations in the course of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress and to assess in a principled manner every party member and candidate member irrespective of the length of his party career or his official position.

The bureau paid special attention to the need, in accordance with the spirit of the times, to steer a consistent line toward ensuring the high degree of combat capability of the party ranks, focusing efforts on educating Communists as active fighters for perestroyka and for the consolidation of the party organizations' businesslike authority in the military collectives and their link with the nonparty masses of servicemen.

It was recommended that a deeper look be taken at the study of the processes of the formation of party ranks. The quantitative growth of the party must not be artificially accelerated nor must a statistical approach be allowed toward the assessment of the party organizations' work, attention must be focused on the quality of reinforcements. Individual work must be stepped up with Communists, especially with young people, with concern being shown for the formation of their world outlook stance. It is essential to take steps promptly to strengthen the party organizations' aktiv, particularly the aktiv of the company, battalion, and staff organizations, by electing to the elected organs the most authoritative Communists and capable organizers who know life and people's feelings and have a sense for what is new. This work will become all the more successful the more emphasis is placed on the opinion of rank and file Communists and the broad public.

The district political directorate has been asked to improve the system for training party organization secretaries and party committee and bureau members in the practice of work and the study and consideration of general party experience and in methods of reinforcing party ranks. Individual forms of the aktiv's instruction and study and reports in political organs and party organizations on people's personal contribution to perestroyka must be practised more widely and the aktiv must be regularly acquainted with the activity of the leading party collectives of formations and units.

The Main Political Directorate Bureau stressed as the most important task the stepping up of the attention paid by the staff and directorate party organizations toward forming in Communists the necessary qualities of political leaders and toward instructing them in methods of communicating with party members and nonparty people and in the ability to hear and listen to people, to hold discussions, and to respond promptly to Communists' proposals and requests.

The political directorates of the branches of the Armed Forces, districts, groups of forces, and fleets have been asked to step up their attention toward elaborating questions and studying the experience of the leadership of primary party organizations, improving their structure, and strengthening party ranks.

Yazov Visits PRAVDA Editorial Office

PM1611144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at Editorial Office"]

[Text] The PRAVDA workers' collective received Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, yesterday at the editorial office.

Dmitriy Timofeyevich spoke in detail about the military-political situation in the world, the progress of perestroyka in the Army and Navy, the tasks which the personnel of units and ships are resolving today, and the unilateral reduction in our military budget, arms, and

Armed Forces personnel. There was a discussion at the meeting about strengthening the prestige of our Army, its problems, and improving the rising generation's military-patriotic education. Special attention was paid to concern for participants in the Great Patriotic War, Soviet Armed Forces veterans, internationalist soldiers, and their families.

In an unconstrained comradely conversation D.T. Yazov answered journalists' questions. In connection with the impending 45th anniversary of the Great Victory, the defense minister handed a group of PRAVDA front-line soldiers memorial gifts.

Golf-Class Sub Withdrawn From Baltic Fleet

90UI0105A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Elimination of Sea-Based Weapons"]

[Text] Baltic Fleet, 1 November—(TASS) The ceremonial withdrawal of one of the diesel-powered missile submarines known in the West as the Golf class has taken place on the territory of a naval unit. First Deputy Chairman of the Main Staff of the Navy Vice Admiral D.M. Komarov reported the following to a TASS correspondent:

"The withdrawal of the missile submarine from the combat forces is the latest stage in the unilateral disarmament measures being undertaken by the Navy on the basis of decisions by the Soviet Government to reduce the USSR Armed Forces and defense spending. Proof of the importance of this event is the fact that the submarine withdrawn from service carries three ballistic missiles with nuclear weapons. As was stated by M.S. Gorbachev in Helsinki, before the end of 1990 the other submarines of this class will also be withdrawn and the nuclear missiles for them destroyed. They will not be replaced. Thus, the policy of a nuclear-free zone in the Baltic Sea proclaimed by the Soviet Government and the deepening of confidence-building measures and security in Europe has been underpinned by practical deeds.

"The ceremony, which took place in the presence of representatives of a public group monitoring the reductions in the armed forces and armaments, is not only of military and political significance, but also has a profound moral significance; namely, that the sailors have said their farewells to a ship sailing under the naval flag under which they carried out their constitutional duty to defend the sacred state interests of the motherland.

"Unfortunately, we do not yet observe actions equivalent to our own in the navies of the NATO countries. As a result, their destabilizing role is growing under conditions of reductions in other kinds of armaments."

'Shield' Military Trade Union Described

90ui0105B Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Oct 89 p 4

[Unattributed report: "The 'Shield' Trade Union"]

[Text] "I have learned that a military trade union has been set up in Moscow that will defend the rights of servicemen." [signed] A. Kalich, Priozersk

We contacted a member of the organizing committee of the "Shield" Union for the Social Protection of Servicemen, Draftees, and Members of Their Families, M. Timokhov.

"The 'Shield' union recently held its inaugural congress in Moscow at the Palace of Culture imeni Kurchatov.

"At present the possibilities of our organization are quite limited; we are only providing skilled legal aid for servicemen. But in the future we hope to become a real trade union; that is, we shall be able to provide social protection for servicemen and the members of their families, and to provide necessary material assistance.

"Unfortunately, the Ministry of Defense does not support our activity. But we hope they will understand and support us in the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

Officials Observe Missile Troops, Artillery Day

LD1711203889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Today a festive meeting was held of representatives of the capital and soldiers of the Moscow garrison, devoted to Missile Troops and Artillery Day. In the presidium were: Comrades Zaykov, Yazov, Baklanov, Belousov, the leading officials of a number of ministries and departments, commanders, and veterans of the Soviet Armed forces. [passage omitted]

Estonian Draft 'Refusenik' Sentenced

PM1311151589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Special correspondent Captain Third Rank V. Urban report: "Dictated by Someone Else"]

[Text] Tallinn—The fall draft is under way in Estonia, as it is throughout the country. But straightaway it should be said that the above headline was not chosen because the problem has become widespread in the republic. The situation is quite different.

There are just three draft "refuseniks" in Estonia. But when you read their statements at their neighborhood rayon military commissariats you are immediately on your guard. I will not give their names—there are reasons for this which I will discuss later. Thus, before me are some handwritten sheets. I will quote the text without altering a single word.

"The question arises: Is the Estonian republic occupied or not? The USSR prefers to say not. This question, which has existed for 50 years now, has been answered not just by politicians, but by lawyers and criminal law scholars, including Prof I. Rebane, Prof I. Gryazin, Kh. Lindmyae, and an Estonian Academy of Sciences commission. The conclusion of the commission on the events of 1939-1940 was that the Estonian Republic was occupied and annexed.

"On the basis of the above, I, Citizen F., refuse to serve in the USSR forces of occupation."

The second statement repeats the first almost word for word. There are other examples. A representative of the Estonian National Independence Party [PNNE] accompanied one of the draftees to the rayon military commissariat. At a rally in Tallinn he said that he knew a way to avoid joining the Army, and was waiting for an approach. Such "recipes" appeared quite recently on informals' stands in Viru.

As we can see, the issue has become political. But there is a counterargument here, too. Draftee V. first received his draft papers back in spring. But at the assembly center he complained of back pain and the republic draft commission gave him a 6-month deferment for treatment. This time there has been no complaint about his health, but now politics has "intervened."

Of course, I will not claim that politics is not necessary in this area. The republic has raised a number of issues connected with drafting Estonian young people for military service—and these issues are being resolved. More than one-fourth of draftees will be sent to the Baltic Military District and 20 percent to units bearing the honored names of cities in the republic. There will be more local guys in border guards and internal troop units stationed on the republic's territory. The Armed Forces General Staff has met the republic leadership's proposal halfway.

Incidentally, judging by the recent statements by the PNNE and the Estonian People's Front, their leaders have openly declared a power struggle, using for this purpose the campaign now under way for election to local self-government organs. In their opinion, the Estonian Communist Party should stand aside.

One can quite understand why these "healers" who have recently started appealing increasingly frequently to draftees should have turned up. But nonetheless, as is well known, every man is himself responsible for his own actions as a specific legal person. In early October a people's court sentenced one of the "refuseniks"—E. Luyk of Pylvaskiy Rayon. The sentence was 18 months' suspended imprisonment conditional on his being sent to carry out forced labor. The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Court Judicial Collegium on Criminal Cases upheld the sentence after hearing an appeal from the defendant's lawyer.

What about the two others?

"We have to pass their cases on to the Prosecutor's Office," Colonel N. Redko, chief of the republic military commissariat's political department, said. "But we have not yet done so. We want to give the guys time to weigh everything up. After all, it is noticeable that their statements were dictated to them by someone else."

During the draft the republic military commissariat invited back Estonian soldiers from the Leningrad and Belorussian Military Districts so that the draftees could hear their opinions about service and the processes taking place in the Army. Previously a delegation from the large ASW vessel "Tallinn"—on which 48 representatives of the republic are serving—had visited the city from the Pacific Fleet. There was a meeting with the parents of the men serving on the "Tallinn." Nobody called into question the need to serve. Incidentally, even the parents of "refuseniks" do not generally support their sons' actions.

After all, parents, unlike those who dictated the statements, are concerned about their children's future.